arXiv:math/0501494v1 [math.RT] 27 Jan 2005

# SINGULAR POLYNOMIALS AND MODULES FOR THE SYMMETRIC GROUPS

CHARLES F. DUNKL

Abstract. For certain negative rational numbers $\kappa_0$, called singular values, and associated with the symmetric group $S_N$ on $N$ objects, there exist homogeneous polynomials annihilated by each Dunkl operator when the parameter $\kappa = \kappa_0$. It was shown by de Jeu, Opdam and the author (Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 346 (1994), 237-256) that the singular values are exactly the values $-\frac{m}{n}$ with $2 \leq n \leq N$, $m = 1, 2, \ldots$ and $\frac{m}{n}$ is not an integer. For each pair $(m, n)$ satisfying these conditions there is a unique irreducible $S_N$-module of singular polynomials for the singular value $-\frac{m}{n}$. The existence of these polynomials was previously established by the author (IMRN 2004, #67, 3607-3635). The uniqueness is proven in the present paper. By using Murphy's (J. Alg. 69(1981), 287-297) results on the eigenvalues of the Murphy elements, the problem of existence of singular polynomials is first restricted to the isotype $\tau$ (where $\tau$ is a partition of $N$ corresponding to an irreducible representation of $S_N$) satisfying the condition that $n/\gcd(m, n)$ divides $\tau_i + 1$ for $1 \leq i < l$; $l$ is the length of $\tau$, that is, $\tau_l > \tau_{l+1} = 0$. Then by arguments involving the analysis of nonsymmetric Jack polynomials it is shown that the assumption $\tau_2 \geq n/\gcd(m, n)$ leads to a contradiction. This shows that the singular polynomials are exactly those already determined, and are of isotype $\tau$, where $\tau_2 = \ldots = \tau_{l-1} = (n/\gcd(m, n)) - 1 \geq \tau_l$.

## 1. Introduction

The symmetric group $S_N$ on $N$ letters acts on $\mathbb{R}^N$ by permutation of coordinates. The alternating polynomial, also called the discriminant, is defined by $a_N(x) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (x_i - x_j)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and is a fundamental object associated to the group. The Macdonald-Mehta-Selberg integral for $S_N$ is

$$(2\pi)^{-N/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |a_N(x)|^{2\kappa} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i^2\right) dx = \prod_{n=2}^{N} \frac{\Gamma(n\kappa + 1)}{\Gamma(\kappa + 1)},$$

for $\kappa \geq 0$. The right hand side is a meromorphic function of $\kappa$ without zeroes and with poles at $\kappa = -\frac{m}{n}$, for $2 \leq n \leq N, m = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ and $\frac{m}{n}$ is not an integer. (For an algebraic proof of the integral, see [5, Sect. 8.7].) Do these values have another connection with the symmetric group? The purpose of this paper is to show that for each pair $(m, n)$ of natural numbers with $2 \leq n \leq N$ and $\frac{m}{n}$ not an integer there is a unique irreducible $S_N$-module of homogeneous polynomials which have a

---

*Date*: January 26, 2005.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20C30, 05E10; Secondary 16S32.

*Key words and phrases.* singular polynomials, Murphy elements, nonsymmetric Jack polynomials.

During the preparation of this paper the author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS 0100539.

certain singularity property with respect to a commutative algebra of differential-difference operators. In a previous paper [2] the author established the existence of a space of such polynomials for each pair $(m, n)$. This paper proves the uniqueness of the polynomials and the associated modules. By use of the Murphy elements one can find a link between the singular polynomials, the partition of $N$ which labels the module and the nonsymmetric Jack polynomials (NSJP's). This is the family of simultaneous eigenvectors of a commuting set $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ of operators (involving a parameter $\kappa$). The singular polynomials come from the specializations of certain of NSJP's when $\kappa$ takes the value $-\frac{m}{n}$. The algebra generated by the $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)$ is semisimple (that is, the set of NSJP's forms a basis for all polynomials) for generic $\kappa$, but this property may be lost for some negative rational values. A part of the development is to show how to find limits of certain expressions in the NSJP's as $\kappa$ approaches $-\frac{m}{n}$.

Murphy [9] found the eigenvalues of the Murphy elements when restricted to any irreducible $S_N$-module. In Section 2 we use his results to find a necessary condition on a partition to allow corresponding singular polynomials and also to prove a uniqueness result. The condition is this: suppose $\gcd(m, n) = 1$ and there is an $S_N$-module of singular polynomials corresponding to $\kappa = -\frac{m}{n}$, and suppose the module is labeled by the partition $\tau$ (that is, $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots)$ with $\sum_{i \geq 1} \tau_i = N$ and $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \ldots \geq 0$) then $n | (\tau_i + 1)$ for $1 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$, where $\ell(\tau) = \max\{j : \tau_j \geq 1\}$). Section 3 develops the relevant results on NSJP's. In Section 4 it is shown that the two-part partitions of the form $(N - n, n)$ with $n | (N - n + 1)$ can not give rise to singular polynomials. Section 5 completes the proof of the main result: if $\tau_2 \geq n$ then there can not be corresponding singular polynomials. This shows that the class of partitions, namely, $\tau$ with $n | (\tau_1 + 1)$ and $\tau_2 = \tau_3 = \ldots = \tau_{\ell(\tau)-1} = n - 1$, appearing in [2] is exhaustive. In Section 6 there is a restatement of the main theorem and a discussion of the relation between singular polynomials and modules over the rational Cherednik algebra.

The group $S_N$ is the finite reflection group of type $A_{N-1}$ and it acts by permutation of coordinates. Let $\mathbb{N}_0$ denote $\{0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ (also $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$, $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ denote the sets of integers and rational numbers respectively). For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ (called a "composition") let $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i$ and define the monomial $x^\alpha$ to be $\prod_{i=1}^N x_i^{\alpha_i}$; its degree is $|\alpha|$. The length of a composition $\alpha$ is $\ell(\alpha) = \max\{j : \alpha_j > 0\}$. Consider elements of $S_N$ as permutations on $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. Then, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $w \in S_N$ let $(xw)_i = x_{w(i)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ and extend this action to polynomials by $(wf)(x) = f(xw)$. This has the effect that monomials transform to monomials: $w(x^\alpha) = x^{w\alpha}$ where $(w\alpha)_i = \alpha_{w^{-1}(i)}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$. (Consider $x$ as a row vector, $\alpha$ as a column vector, and $w$ as a permutation matrix, with 1's at the $(w(j), j)$ entries.) The reflections in $S_N$ are the transpositions interchanging $x_i$ and $x_j$ and are denoted by $(i, j)$ for $i \neq j$.

In [1] the author constructed for each finite reflection group a parametrized commutative algebra of differential-difference operators. Let $\kappa$ be a formal parameter, that is, $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$ is a transcendental extension of $\mathbb{Q}$.

**Definition 1.** *The space of polynomials is* $\mathcal{P} := \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \{x^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N\}$ *and for* $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *the subspace of homogeneous polynomials of degree* $n$ *is* $\mathcal{P}_n := \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \{x^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N, |\alpha| = n\}$. *For* $p \in \mathcal{P}$ *and* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ *let* $\operatorname{coef}(p, \alpha)$ *denote the coefficient of* $x^\alpha$ *in* $p$ *(thus* $p = \sum_\beta \operatorname{coef}(p, \beta)\, x^\beta$*).*

For the symmetric group $S_N$ the operators are defined as follows:

**Definition 2.** *For any polynomial $f$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$ let*

$$\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) f(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} f(x) + \kappa \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{f(x) - (ij) f(x)}{x_i - x_j}.$$

It was shown in [1] that $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)\mathcal{D}_j(\kappa) = \mathcal{D}_j(\kappa)\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ and each $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$ maps $\mathcal{P}_n$ to $\mathcal{P}_{n-1}$ for $n \geq 1$. A specific numerical parameter value $\kappa_0$ is said to be a *singular value* (associated with $S_N$) if there exists a nonzero polynomial $p$ such that $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) p = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ : such a $p$ is called a *singular polynomial*. It was shown in [4] that the singular values are the numbers $-\frac{m}{n}$ where $n = 2, \ldots, N$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\frac{m}{n} \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Earlier, Opdam [10] showed that the $S_N$-Bessel function $J(x, y)$ considered as a function of the parameter $\kappa$ has poles precisely at these numbers (for $\kappa > 0$ the Bessel function is the entire solution of the system of equations $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\mathcal{D}_j^{(x)}(\kappa)\right)^k J(x, y) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} y_j^k\right) J(x, y)$, $1 \leq k \leq N$, $J(0, y) = 1$, $J(xw, y) = J(x, yw) = J(x, y)$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^N$). Because the operators $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$ preserve homogeneity and have the $S_N$-transformation property $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)(i, j) = (i, j)\mathcal{D}_j(\kappa)$, the set of singular polynomials for a specific singular value is a direct sum of irreducible $S_N$-modules of homogeneous polynomials. The set of partitions of length $\leq N$ is denoted by $\mathbb{N}_0^{N,P}$ and consists of all $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ such that $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N - 1$. When writing partitions it is customary to suppress trailing zeros and to use exponents to indicate multiplicity, for example $(5, 2^3)$ is the same as $(5, 2, 2, 2, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{5,P}$. (The exponent notation is also used for compositions.)

The irreducible representations of $S_N$ are labeled by partitions $\tau$ of $N$ (that is, $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N,P}$ and $|\tau| = N$) and we say a polynomial $f$ is of *isotype* $\tau$ if $f$ is an element of an irreducible $S_N$-submodule of $\mathcal{P}_n$ corresponding to $\tau$. It was conjectured in [4] that the two-part representations $(n - 1, N - n + 1)$ (with $2(n-1) \geq N$) give rise to singular polynomials for the singular values $-\frac{m}{n}$ with $\gcd(m, n) < \frac{n}{N-n+1}$, and the representations $(dn - 1, n - 1, \ldots, n - 1, \tau_l)$ for $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$ give rise to singular polynomials for the singular values $-\frac{m}{n}$ with $\gcd(m, n) = 1$ (where $l = \ell(\tau)$ and $N = (dn - 1) + (l - 2)(n - 1) + \tau_l$). This construction is presented in [2] in terms of nonsymmetric Jack polynomials. In this paper we show that there are no other singular polynomials. By using Murphy's techniques in his construction of the Young seminormal representations [9] we can show that the isotype $\tau$ of any irreducible module of singular polynomials for $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ (with $\gcd(m, n) = 1$) must satisfy $n | (\tau_i + 1)$ for $1 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$. After that most of the work is to show that the assumption $\tau_2 \geq n$ leads to a contradiction. Note that the condition $\tau_2 < n$ implies for three or more parts $\tau_i = n - 1$ for $2 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$ (and $\tau_{\ell(\tau)} \leq n - 1$) and for two parts that $\tau_2 < \dfrac{\tau_1 + 1}{\gcd(m_1, \tau_1 + 1)} = n$ for the singular value $-\frac{m_1}{\tau_1 + 1}$. These are the restrictions described above.

The notation is almost the same as that in [2] except that the parameter has been incorporated. Key parts of the proofs depend on the behavior of polynomials as $\kappa$ approaches a singular value $\kappa_0$. The commutative algebra of the operators defining the nonsymmetric Jack polynomials is generated by

$$\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) f(x) = \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) x_i f(x) - \kappa \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (j,i) f(x), 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

(this differs by the additive constant $\kappa$ from the notation in [5, Ch.8]). The operators act in a triangular manner on monomials, as is explained below.

**Definition 3.** *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$, let $\alpha^+$ denote the unique partition such that $\alpha^+ = w\alpha$ for some $w \in S_N$. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ the partial order $\alpha \succ \beta$ ($\alpha$ dominates $\beta$) means that $\alpha \neq \beta$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{j} \alpha_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{j} \beta_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq N$; $\alpha \rhd \beta$ means that $|\alpha| = |\beta|$ and either $\alpha^+ \succ \beta^+$ or $\alpha^+ = \beta^+$ and $\alpha \succ \beta$. The notations $\alpha \succeq \beta$ and $\alpha \trianglerighteq \beta$ include the case $\alpha = \beta$.*

When acting on the monomial basis of $\mathcal{P}_n$ the operators $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)$ have on-diagonal coefficients involving the following *rank* function on $\mathbb{N}_0^N$. We denote the cardinality of a set $E$ by $\#E$.

**Definition 4.** *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$ let*

$$\begin{aligned} r(\alpha, i) &= \#\{j : \alpha_j > \alpha_i\} + \#\{j : 1 \leq j \leq i, \alpha_j = \alpha_i\}, \\ \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) &= (N - r(\alpha, i))\kappa + \alpha_i + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly for a fixed $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ the values $\{r(\alpha, i) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ consist of all of $\{1, \ldots, N\}$, are independent of trailing zeros (that is, if $\alpha' \in \mathbb{N}_0^M, \alpha'_i = \alpha_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $\alpha'_i = 0$ for $N < i \leq M$ then $r(\alpha, i) = r(\alpha', i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$), and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N,P}$ if and only if $r(\alpha, i) = i$ for all $i$ (the latter property motivated the use of "$1 \leq j \leq i$" rather than "$1 \leq j < i$" in the definition). Then (see [5, p.291]) $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) x^\alpha = \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) x^\alpha + q_{\alpha,i}(x)$ where $q_{\alpha,i}(x)$ is a sum of terms $\pm\kappa x^\beta$ with $\alpha \rhd \beta$. The nonsymmetric Jack polynomials are the simultaneous eigenvectors of $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ and they are well-defined for generic $\kappa$.

## 2. $S_N$-MODULES

In this section we find necessary conditions on a partition $\tau$ of $N$ for the existence of singular polynomials of isotype $\tau$. Suppose $f$ is a singular polynomial for some singular value $\kappa_0$. We may assume $f$ is homogeneous because the operators $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$ are homogeneous and that $f$ has rational coefficients ($\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0)$ is a rational operator). Any translate of $f$ by $S_N$ is singular so $\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{wf : w \in S_N\}$ is an $S_N$-module of singular polynomials for $\kappa_0$. Suppose one of the irreducible components has isotype $\tau$, for some partition $\tau$ with $|\tau| = N$. This decomposition is a computation over $\mathbb{Q}$ (from the representation theory of $S_N$). Henceforth we restrict our attention to this module, denoted by $M$.

We turn to the application of Murphy's results. For any given isotype he determined the eigenvalues and transformation properties of the eigenvectors of the commuting operators $\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (i,j) : 2 \leq i \leq N\right\}$ (Jucys-Murphy elements). The results have to be read in reverse in a certain sense.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose $f$ is a singular polynomial for $\kappa = \kappa_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$, then $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f = f + \kappa_0 \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} (i,j) f$.*

*Proof.* We have the commutation $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)(x_i f) = x_i \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) f + f + \kappa \sum_{j \neq i} (i,j) f$. Now set $\kappa = \kappa_0$ and note that $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f = \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0)(x_i f) - \kappa_0 \sum_{j<i} (i,j) f = -\kappa_0 \sum_{j<i} (i,j) f$. □

Denote the Murphy elements $\omega_i = \sum\limits_{j=N-i+2}^{N} (N+1-i,j)$ for $2 \leq i \leq N$ and let $\omega_1 = 0$ (as a transformation); then $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f = f + \kappa_0 \omega_{N+1-i} f$ for $f \in M$. A *standard Young tableau* (SYT) of shape $\tau$ is a one-to-one assignment of the numbers $\{1, \ldots, N\}$ to the nodes of the Ferrers diagram $\left\{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\tau), 1 \leq j \leq \tau_i\right\}$ so that the entries increase in each row and in each column. The notation $T(i,j)$ refers to the entry at row $i$, column $j$. There is an order on SYT's of given shape (for details see [9, p.288]) and the maximum SYT in this order, denoted by $T_0$, is produced by entering the numbers $1, 2, \ldots, N$ row by row (the first row is $1, \ldots, \tau_1$, the second is $\tau_1 + 1, \ldots, \tau_1 + \tau_2$ and so forth).

**Definition 5.** *Let $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N,P}$ with $|\tau| = N$, and let $Y(\tau)$ denote the set of SYT's of shape $\tau$. Suppose $T \in Y(\tau)$ then let $rw(i,T), cm(i,T), \eta_i(T) := cm(i,T) - rw(i,T)$ denote the row, column and content, respectively of the node of $T$ containing $i$, for $1 \leq i \leq N$.*

(With this notation $T(rw(i,T), cm(i,T)) = i$.) Murphy constructed a basis $\{f_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$ for the irreducible representation of isotype $\tau$ such that $\omega_i f_T = \eta_i(T) f_T$ for each $i$ and $T$ (actually, this is an isomorphic image of the construction, which is in terms of specific polynomials, of minimal degree). The eigenvalues $(\eta_1(T), \ldots, \eta_N(T))$ determine the SYT $T$ uniquely thus there is a unique (up to scalar multiplication) basis $\{f_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$ for $M$ with

$$\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f_T = (1 + \kappa_0 \eta_{N+1-i}(T)) f_T, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq N, \ T \in Y(\tau).$$

(The argument for uniqueness of $T$ is in [9]: one can reconstruct $T$ by adjoining boxes containing $2, 3, \ldots, N$ to 1 by using the values $\eta_2(T), \ldots, \eta_N(T)$; at any stage the locations at which one can adjoin a box to make a larger SYT have different contents.) We will show that $f_{T_0}$ is (a multiple of) $x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \lhd \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$ with coefficients $A_\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N,P}$ with

$$\lambda_{N+1-i} = -\kappa_0 \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (\tau_j + 1), \text{ for } \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j < i \leq \sum_{j=1}^{s} \tau_j. \tag{2.1}$$

This implies that if $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ with $\gcd(m,n) = 1$ then $n | (\tau_j + 1)$ for $1 \leq j < \ell(\tau)$ (the maximum value for $s$ in the above formula). The proof relies on the triangularity properties of the $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0)$ with respect to the order $\rhd$.

**Definition 6.** *For each $T \in Y(\tau)$ let $C_T = \left\{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N : \operatorname{coef}(f_T, \beta) \neq 0\right\}$. Let $C$ be the set of $\alpha \in \cup_{T \in Y(\tau)} C_T$ such that $\alpha$ is $\rhd$-maximal in some $C_T$ (that is, $\alpha, \beta \in C_T$ and $\beta \trianglerighteq \alpha$ implies $\beta = \alpha$).*

**Lemma 1.** *If $\alpha$ is a $\rhd$-maximal element of $C$ then $\alpha$ is a partition.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for any $\beta \in \cup_T C_T$ there exists a partition $\lambda \in C$ with $\lambda \trianglerighteq \beta$. Since $M = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{f_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$ is $S_N$-invariant we see that for any $w \in S_N$ and $\beta \in C_T$ for some $T$ there exists $T_1 \in Y(\tau)$ such that $w\beta \in C_{T_1}$ (note that $w f_T(x) = f_T(xw)$ and $w\left(x^\beta\right) = x^{w\beta}$). So $\cup_T C_T$ is $S_N$-invariant, in particular if $\beta \in \cup_T C_T$ then $\beta^+ \in \cup_T C_T$. Thus there exists $\gamma \in C$ such that $\gamma \trianglerighteq \beta^+$. Since $C$ is finite the maximal elements $\alpha$ satisfy $\alpha \trianglerighteq \alpha^+$, that is, $\alpha$ is a partition. $\square$

The next step is to show that there is a unique maximal element in $C$ determined by equation 2.1.

**Lemma 2.** *If $T \in Y(\tau)$ satisfies $\eta_{s+1}(T) \leq \eta_s(T) + 1$ for $1 \leq s < N$ then $T = T_0$.*

*Proof.* We have to show that the condition implies $rw(s,T) \leq rw(s+1,T)$ for each $s$. Fix $s$ and let $T(i_1,j_1) = s$ and $T(i_2,j_2) = s+1$ so that $\eta_s(T) - \eta_{s+1}(T) = (j_1 - j_2) + (i_2 - i_1)$. We list the possibilities for these nodes in any SYT. If $s$ and $s+1$ are in the same row of $T$ then $i_2 = i_1, j_2 = j_1 + 1$ and $\eta_{s+1}(T) = \eta_s(T) + 1$. If $s$ and $s+1$ are in the same column of $T$ then $i_2 = i_1 + 1, j_2 = j_1$ and $\eta_{s+1}(T) = \eta_s(T) - 1$. The condition $i_1 < i_2$ and $j_1 < j_2$ is impossible or else $s < T(i_2, j_1) < s+1$. Also the condition $i_1 > i_2$ and $j_1 > j_2$ is impossible or else $s+1 < T(i_1,j_2) < s$. If $i_1 < i_2$ and $j_1 > j_2$ then $\eta_s(T) - \eta_{s+1}(T) \geq 2$. The case $i_1 > i_2$ and $j_1 < j_2$ is ruled out by hypothesis because it implies $\eta_s(T) - \eta_{s+1}(T) \leq -2$. $\square$

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose $\lambda$ is a $\rhd$-maximal element of $C$ then $\lambda$ is $\rhd$-maximal in $C_{T_0}$ and is given by equation 2.1.*

*Proof.* By hypothesis $\lambda$ is a partition and is $\rhd$-maximal in $C_T$ for some $T \in Y(\tau)$. By the triangularity property of $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{coef}\left(\left(1 + \kappa_0 \eta_{N+1-i}(T)\right) f_T, \lambda\right) &= \operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f_T, \lambda\right) \\ &= \xi_i(\lambda; \kappa_0) \operatorname{coef}(f_T, \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

and $\xi_i(\lambda;\kappa_0) = (N-i)\kappa_0 + \lambda_i + 1$, for $1 \leq i \leq N$. This gives the equations

$$\begin{aligned} (N-i)\kappa_0 + \lambda_i + 1 &= 1 + \kappa_0 \eta_{N+1-i}(T), \\ \lambda_{N+1-i} &= \kappa_0 \left(\eta_i(T) + 1 - i\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda$ is a partition $\lambda_{N+1-i} \leq \lambda_{N-i}$ for $1 \leq i < N$ and thus $\eta_i(T) + 1 - i \geq \eta_{i+1}(T) + 1 - (i+1)$ (note that $\kappa_0 < 0$). By Lemma 2 $T = T_0$. By definition of $T_0$ for $1 \leq i \leq \tau_1$ we have $\eta_i(T_0) = i - 1$ thus $\lambda_{N+1-i} = 0$. In the range $\sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j + 1 \leq i \leq \sum_{j=1}^{s} \tau_j$ (row $s$ of $T_0$) $\eta_i(T_0) = \left(i - \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j\right) - s$ and $\lambda_{N+1-i} = -\kappa_0 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j + s - 1\right) = -\kappa_0 \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (\tau_j + 1)$. $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *There is a unique $\rhd$-maximal element $\lambda$ of $C$ given by equation 2.1, and $n | (\tau_j + 1)$ for $1 \leq j < \ell(\tau)$ (where $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ and $\gcd(m,n) = 1$).*

*Proof.* The uniqueness is now obvious. The equation $\lambda_{N+1-i} = m \sum\limits_{j=1}^{s-1} \dfrac{\tau_j + 1}{n}$ for $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j < i \leq \sum\limits_{j=1}^{s} \tau_j$ shows inductively that $n | (\tau_j + 1)$ for $1 \leq j < \ell(\tau)$; since the maximum value of $s$ is $\ell(\tau)$. $\square$

**Corollary 2.** *For any $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ and partition $\tau$ of $N$ there is at most one irreducible $S_N$-module, consisting of singular polynomials for the singular value $\kappa_0$, that has isotype $\tau$.*

*Proof.* Suppose there are two unequal modules $M$ and $M'$ satisfying the hypotheses. Let $\{f_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$ and $\{f'_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$ be the respective bases for $M$ and $M'$ produced by Murphy's construction. Normalize the two bases so that both $f_{T_0}$ and $f'_{T_0}$ are monic in $x^\lambda$ (that is, $f_{T_0} = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \lhd \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$ and $f'_{T_0}$ has the same form with $A_\beta$ replaced by $A'_\beta$), with $\lambda$ given by equation 2.1. Let $g_T = f_T - f'_T$ for $T \in Y(\tau)$, then $\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{g_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$ consists of singular polynomials and its basis has the same transformation properties under the action of $S_N$ as the basis of $M$. By the Theorem $\operatorname{coef}(g_{T_0}, \lambda) \neq 0$, which is a contradiction. □

The following summarizes the results of this section. The polynomial $f_{T_0}$ is renamed $g_\lambda$.

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose there exist singular polynomials for $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ with $\gcd(m,n) = 1$ (and $2 \leq n \leq N$) of isotype $\tau$, a partition of $N$, then $n | (\tau_i + 1)$ for $1 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$ and there is a unique singular polynomial $g_\lambda = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \lhd \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$ (with $A_\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$) of isotype $\tau$ such that $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) g_\lambda = \xi_i(\lambda; \kappa_0) g_\lambda$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$, where $\lambda$ is given by equation 2.1.*

## 3. Nonsymmetric Jack polynomials

These polynomials are the simultaneous eigenvectors of the commuting set of operators $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. The existence follows from the triangular property and the fact that the correspondence (from compositions to eigenvalues) $\alpha \longmapsto (\xi_i(\alpha;\kappa))_{i=1}^N$ is one-to-one for generic $\kappa$. We use the notation from [2] (for now just the $x$-monic version is used but there will be a reference to the $p$-monic version).

**Definition 7.** *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$, let $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ denote the $x$-monic simultaneous eigenvectors, that is, $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) = \xi_i(\alpha;\kappa) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) = x^\alpha + \sum\limits_{\beta \lhd \alpha} A_{\beta\alpha}^x(\kappa) x^\beta$, with coefficients $A_{\beta\alpha}^x(\kappa) \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$.*

**Definition 8.** *For $1 \leq i \leq N$ the operators $\mathcal{B}_{ij}$ (with $j \neq i$) and the operator $\mathcal{B}_i$ (each maps $\mathcal{P}_n$ into itself, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$) are given by*

$$\mathcal{B}_{ij} p(x) := \frac{x_i p(x) - x_j p(x(i,j))}{x_i - x_j} - \begin{cases} 0, & i < j \\ p(x(i,j)), & i > j, \end{cases}$$
$$\mathcal{B}_i p := \sum_{j \neq i} \mathcal{B}_{ij} p, \text{ for } p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

In this notation $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) p(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(x_i p(x)) + \kappa \mathcal{B}_i p(x)$. There is an easily proved identity: $\mathcal{B}_{ij} + \mathcal{B}_{ji} = 1$, and this shows directly that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) = N + \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \kappa \frac{N(N-1)}{2}.$$

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ and $i \neq j$ by direct computation we obtain:

$$\mathcal{B}_{ij} x^\alpha = \sum_{l=0}^{\alpha_i - \alpha_j} \left( \frac{x_j}{x_i} \right)^l x^\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha_i \geq \alpha_j, i < j, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{ij} x^\alpha = \sum_{l=0}^{\alpha_i - \alpha_j - 1} \left( \frac{x_j}{x_i} \right)^l x^\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha_i \geq \alpha_j, i > j, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{ij} x^\alpha = - \sum_{l=1}^{\alpha_j - \alpha_i - 1} \left( \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right)^l x^\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha_i < \alpha_j, i < j, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{ij} x^\alpha = - \sum_{l=1}^{\alpha_j - \alpha_i} \left( \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right)^l x^\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha_i < \alpha_j, i > j. \tag{3.4}$$

There is another invariant subspace structure for $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)\}$ besides the $\rhd$-triangular property. The purpose of the following arguments is to allow the computation of certain coefficients of $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ crucial in the arguments of Section 5.

**Definition 9.** *For $1 \leq s \leq N$ and $n \geq 1$ let*

$$I_{s,n}^{(N)} := \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N : \alpha_i < n \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq s, \ \alpha_i \leq n \text{ for } s+1 \leq i \leq N \right\},$$
$$P_{s,n}^{(N)} := \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \left\{ x^\alpha : \alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)} \right\}.$$

Note that each $I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ is finite and $P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ is the direct sum of its homogeneous subspaces $P_{s,n}^{(N)} \cap \mathcal{P}_k, k \geq 0$.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose $1 \leq s \leq N$ and $n \geq 1$, then $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) P_{s,n}^{(N)} \subset P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$, and $\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \left\{ \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) : \alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)} \right\} = P_{s,n}^{(N)}$.*

*Proof.* Let $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$. It suffices to show $\mathcal{B}_{ij} x^\alpha \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ for all $i, j$. By formulae 3.1-3.4 this is obvious for $1 \leq i, j \leq s$ or $s+1 \leq i, j \leq N$, or $\max(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) < n$. Only the two cases $1 \leq i \leq s, \alpha_j = n$ (thus $j > s$) and $1 \leq j \leq s, \alpha_i = n$ (with $i > s$) remain to be considered. Formulae 3.3 and 3.2 respectively show that $\mathcal{B}_{ij} x^\alpha \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$. For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ the eigenvector $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ is contained in the orbit of $x^\alpha$ under the algebra generated by $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)\}$ hence $x^\alpha \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ implies $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$. That the span of $\{\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)\}$ is all of $P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ follows easily (dimension argument, for example). $\square$

**Definition 10.** *For a partition $\lambda$ and an integer $s$ with $1 \leq s \leq N$ define the insertion operator $\iota(s; \lambda) : \mathbb{N}_0^N \to \mathbb{N}_0^{N+\ell(\lambda)}$ as follows: for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$*

$$(\iota(s; \lambda)\alpha)_i = \begin{cases} \alpha_i, & 1 \leq i \leq s \\ \lambda_{i-s}, & s < i \leq s + \ell(\lambda) \\ \alpha_{i-\ell(\lambda)}, & s + \ell(\lambda) < i \leq N + \ell(\lambda). \end{cases}$$

The definition is only interesting when $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ where $n = \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}$, in which case the following rank equations hold: let $\beta = \iota(s; \lambda)\alpha$ and $k = \ell(\lambda)$, then $r(\beta, i) = r(\alpha, i) + k$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, $r(\beta, i) = r(\alpha, i-k) + k$ for $s + k < i \leq N + k$, and $r(\beta, i) = i - s$ for $s + 1 \leq i \leq s + k$.

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose $\lambda$ is a partition, $1 \leq s \leq N$, $\alpha, \beta \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ where $n = \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}$, and $\alpha \rhd \beta$, then* $\operatorname{coef}\left( \zeta_{\iota(s,\lambda)\alpha}^x(\kappa), \iota(s,\lambda)\beta \right) = \operatorname{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \beta)$.

It suffices to prove this for $\ell(\lambda) = 1$ because then one can insert one part of $\lambda$ at a time in nondecreasing order: explicitly let $\lambda^{(j)} = \left(\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)+1-j}, \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)+2-j}, \ldots, \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}\right)$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)$, then $\iota\left(s, \left(\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)-j}\right)\right) \iota\left(s, \lambda^{(j)}\right) = \iota\left(s, \lambda^{(j+1)}\right)$; also if $\alpha, \beta \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ then $\iota\left(s, \lambda^{(j)}\right) \alpha \in I_{s,k}^{(N+j)}$ where $k = \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)+1-j}$ and $\alpha \rhd \beta$ implies $\iota\left(s, \lambda^{(j)}\right) \alpha \rhd \iota\left(s, \lambda^{(j)}\right) \beta$.

For arbitrary $M \geq 1$ let $\mathcal{P}^{(M)} = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)}\left\{x^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^M\right\}$ and let $\mathcal{U}_i^{(M)}(\kappa)$ denote the operator $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)$ for $M$ variables. For $M > N$ let $\pi_{MN}$ be the projection from $\mathcal{P}^{(M)}$ onto $\mathcal{P}^{(N)}$ defined by setting $x_{N+1} = x_{N+2} = \ldots = x_M = 0$. The coefficients of the $\zeta_\alpha^x$ do not depend on the number of variables (that is coef $(\zeta_\alpha^x, \beta)$ is independent of $N \geq \max(\ell(\alpha), \ell(\beta))$) because of the intertwining relation

$$\pi_{MN} \mathcal{U}_i^{(M)}(\kappa) = \left(\mathcal{U}_i^{(N)}(\kappa) + (M-N)\kappa\right) \pi_{MN}, \tag{3.5}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq N < M$. Fix integers $n, s$ with $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq s \leq N$ and define the map $\iota_{s,n} : \mathcal{P}^{(N)} \to \mathcal{P}^{(N+1)}$ by $\iota_{s,n} x^\alpha = x^\beta$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ and $\beta = \iota(s,(n))\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s, n, \alpha_{s+1}, \ldots, \alpha_N)$ and extending by linearity to all polynomials. Direct computation yields the identities:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{U}_i^{(N+1)}(\kappa)\, \iota_{s,n} - \iota_{s,n} \mathcal{U}_i^{(N)}(\kappa) = \kappa \mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} \iota_{s,n}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq s, \\
&\mathcal{U}_{i+1}^{(N+1)}(\kappa)\, \iota_{s,n} - \iota_{s,n} \mathcal{U}_i^{(N)}(\kappa) = \kappa \mathcal{B}_{i+1,s+1} \iota_{s,n}, \text{ for } s+1 \leq i \leq N.
\end{aligned}$$

We show that if $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ then $\iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ is congruent to $\zeta_{\iota(s,(n))\alpha}^x(\kappa)$ modulo the subspace $P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$. To illustrate the argument, suppose there is a linear operator $\mathcal{V}$ with an invariant subspace $E$ and there is a vector $f$ and number $c$ so that $\mathcal{V}f - cf \in E$ then $f - \left((\mathcal{V}-c)|_E\right)^{-1}(\mathcal{V}f - cf)$ is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{V}$ with eigenvalue $c$, provided that the restriction of $\mathcal{V} - c$ to $E$ is invertible. This can be adapted for simultaneous eigenvectors of pairwise commuting operators by extending the base field $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$, adjoining another formal variable (transcendental) $v$ and considering just one operator $\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \mathcal{U}_i^{(N)}(\kappa)$ (or $\sum_{i=1}^{N+1} v^i \mathcal{U}_i^{(N+1)}(\kappa)$, as appropriate). The eigenvalues $\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \xi_i(\alpha;\kappa)$ are simple ($\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ and generic $\kappa$). Denote the field $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa, v)$ by $\mathbb{K}$.

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose* $1 \leq s \leq N$ *and* $n \geq 1$. *If* $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ *then* $\iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) = \zeta_{\iota(s,(n))\alpha}^x(\kappa) + f_\alpha$ *for some* $f_\alpha \in P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$.

*Proof.* First we show $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} \iota_{s,n} P_{s,n}^{(N)} \subset P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$ for $i \neq s+1$. Let $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ and $\beta = \iota(s,(n))\alpha$. For $1 \leq i \leq s$ by Formula 3.3 $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta = -\sum_{l=1}^{n-\alpha_i-1} \left(\frac{x_i}{x_{s+1}}\right)^l x^\beta$ with the key (change from $\beta$) terms being $x_i^{\alpha_i+l} x_{s+1}^{n-l}$ where $\alpha_i + 1 \leq \alpha_i + l \leq n-1$ and $\alpha_i + 1 \leq n - l \leq n-1$; if $\alpha_i = n-1$ then $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta = 0$. Suppose $s+2 \leq i \leq N+1$; if $\alpha_{i-1} = n = \beta_i$ then $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta = 0$ by Formula 3.2, if $\alpha_{i-1} = \beta_i < n$ then by Formula 3.4 $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta = -\sum_{l=1}^{n-\beta_i} \left(\frac{x_i}{x_{s+1}}\right)^l x^\beta$ with key terms $x_i^{\beta_i+l} x_{s+1}^{n-l}$ where $\beta_i + 1 \leq \beta_i + l \leq n$ and $\beta_i \leq n - l \leq n-1$. Thus $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta \in P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$.

Temporarily we use a superscript on the eigenvalues $\xi_i(\alpha;\kappa)$ to indicate the number of variables, then

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta;\kappa) &= (N+1-r(\beta,i))\kappa+\beta_i+1\\ &= (N+1-(r(\alpha,i)+1))\kappa+\alpha_i+1=\xi_i^{(N)}(\alpha;\kappa)\end{aligned}$$

for $1\leq i\leq s$ and, similarly, $\xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta;\kappa)=\xi_{i-1}^{(N)}(\alpha;\kappa)$ for $s+2\leq i\leq N+1$. The eigenvalues $\left\{\xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta;\kappa):1\leq i\leq N+1,i\neq s+1\right\}$ and the degree of homogeneity $|\beta|=|\alpha|+n$ determine $\zeta_\beta^x(\kappa)$ uniquely, subject to coef $\left(\zeta_\beta^x(\kappa),\beta\right)=1$, because $\sum_{i=1}^{N+1}\mathcal{U}_i^{(N+1)}(\kappa)=N+1+\sum_{i=1}^{N+1}x_i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}+\kappa\frac{N(N+1)}{2}$. Let

$$\mathcal{V}:=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{s}+\sum_{i=s+2}^{N+1}\right)v^i\mathcal{U}_i^{(N+1)}(\kappa).$$

The polynomials $\left\{\zeta_\gamma^x(\kappa):\gamma\in\mathbb{N}_0^{N+1},|\gamma|=|\alpha|+n\right\}$ form a basis of eigenvectors of $\mathcal{V}$ for $E:=\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{K}}\left\{x^\gamma:\gamma\in\mathbb{N}_0^{N+1},|\gamma|=|\alpha|+n\right\}$ and each eigenvalue is simple. Let $F:=\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{K}}\left\{x^\gamma:\gamma\in I_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)},|\gamma|=|\alpha|+n\right\}$ then $\mathcal{V}F\subset F$ by Lemma 3 . Finally consider

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}\iota_{s,n}\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) &= \sum_{i=1}^{s}v^i\left(\iota_{s,n}\mathcal{U}_i^{(N)}+\kappa\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1}\iota_{s,n}\right)\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)+\\ &\quad+\sum_{i=s+2}^{N+1}v^i\left(\iota_{s,n}\mathcal{U}_{i-1}^{(N)}+\kappa\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1}\iota_{s,n}\right)\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)\\ &= \sum_{i=1,i\neq s+1}^{N+1}v^i\xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta;i)\,\iota_{s,n}\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)+h_\alpha,\end{aligned}$$

where $h_\alpha=\kappa\left(\sum_{i=1}^{s}+\sum_{i=s+2}^{N+1}\right)v^i\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1}\iota_{s,n}\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ and $h_\alpha\in F$, since $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)\in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$. Let $\mathcal{V}_\beta$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{V}-\sum_{i=1,i\neq s+1}^{N+1}v^i\xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta;i)$ to the invariant subspace $F$ and let $f_\alpha=\mathcal{V}_\beta^{-1}h_\alpha$, then $\iota_{s,n}\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)-f_\alpha=\zeta_\beta^x(\kappa)$ because coef $(f_\alpha,\beta)=0$ and coef $(\iota_{s,n}\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa),\beta)=$ coef $(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa),\alpha)=1$. Since $f_\alpha=\iota_{s,n}\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)-\zeta_\beta^x(\kappa)$ the coefficients of $f_\alpha$ are in $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$. □

**Corollary 3.** *Suppose* $\alpha,\gamma\in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ *then*

$$\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_{\iota(s,(n))\alpha}^x(\kappa),\iota(s,(n))\gamma\right)=\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa),\gamma\right).$$

*Proof.* By definition coef $(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa),\gamma)=$ coef $(\iota_{s,n}\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa),\iota(s,(n))\gamma)$. Also $(\iota(s,(n))\gamma)_{s+1}=n$ and thus coef $(f,\iota(s,(n))\gamma)=0$ for any $f\in P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

The poles of the coefficients of $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ play a key role in the analysis of singular polynomials. Knop and Sahi [8] found an algorithm for the evaluation of the coefficients. It uses the idea of extending the definition of Ferrers diagrams to compositions and associating a hook-length to each node in the diagram. The *Ferrers diagram* of a composition $\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^N$ is the set $\{(i,j):1\leq i\leq\ell(\alpha),0\leq j\leq\alpha_i\}$.

For each node $(i,j)$ with $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_i$ there are two special subsets of the Ferrers diagram, the *arm* $\{(i,l) : j < l \leq \alpha_i\}$ and the *leg* $\{(l,j) : l > i, j \leq \alpha_l \leq \alpha_i\} \cup \{(l,j-1) : l < i, j-1 \leq \alpha_l < \alpha_i\}$. The node itself, the arm and the leg make up the *hook*. The definition of hooks for compositions is from [8, p.15]. The cardinality of the leg is called the leg-length, formalized by the following:

**Definition 11.** *For* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N, 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha)$ *and* $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_i$ *the leg-length is*

$$\begin{aligned} L(\alpha; i,j) := \# \{l : l > i, j \leq \alpha_l \leq \alpha_i\} \\ + \# \{l : l < i, j \leq \alpha_l + 1 \leq \alpha_i\}. \end{aligned}$$

*For* $t \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$ *the hook-length and the hook-length product for* $\alpha$ *are given by*

$$h(\alpha, t; i,j) = (\alpha_i - j + t + \kappa L(\alpha; i,j))$$
$$h(\alpha, t) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\alpha)} \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} h(\alpha, t; i,j),$$

Note that the indices $\{i : \alpha_i = 0\}$ are omitted in the product $h(\alpha,t)$. In [2] and [5] we used the notation

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(\alpha) = \prod \left\{1 + \frac{\varepsilon\kappa}{\kappa(r(\alpha,i) - r(\alpha,j)) + \alpha_j - \alpha_i} : i < j,\, \alpha_i < \alpha_j\right\}, \varepsilon = \pm.$$

The denominator also equals $\xi_j(\alpha;\kappa) - \xi_i(\alpha;\kappa)$. The relation to $h(\alpha,t)$ (for the values $t = 1, \kappa+1$ which are of concern here) is the following:

**Lemma 5.** *For* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$, $h(\alpha, \kappa+1) = h(\alpha^+, \kappa+1)\, \mathcal{E}_+(\alpha)$ *and* $h(\alpha, 1) = \dfrac{h(\alpha^+, 1)}{\mathcal{E}_-(\alpha)}$.

*Proof.* We use induction on adjacent transpositions. The statements are true for $\alpha = \alpha^+$. Fix $\alpha^+$ and suppose $\alpha_i > \alpha_{i+1}$ for some $i$. Let $\sigma = (i, i+1)$. Consider the ratio $\dfrac{h(\sigma\alpha, t)}{h(\alpha, t)}$. The only node whose hook-length changes (in the sense of interchanging rows $i$ and $i+1$ of the Ferrers diagram) is $(i, \alpha_{i+1}+1)$. Explicitly $h(\sigma\alpha, t; s,j) = h(\alpha, t; s,j)$ for $s \neq i, i+1$ and $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_s$, $h(\sigma\alpha, t; i,j) = h(\alpha, t; i+1, j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ and $h(\sigma\alpha, t; i+1, j) = h(\alpha, t; i,j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_i$ except for $j = \alpha_{i+1}+1$. Thus $\dfrac{h(\sigma\alpha, t)}{h(\alpha, t)} = \dfrac{h(\sigma\alpha, t; i+1, \alpha_{i+1}+1)}{h(\alpha, t; i, \alpha_{i+1}+1)}$. Note that $L(\sigma\alpha; i+1, \alpha_{i+1}+1) = L(\alpha; i, \alpha_{i+1}+1) + 1$ (the node $(i, \alpha_{i+1})$ is adjoined to the leg). Let

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \{s : s \leq i, \alpha_s \geq \alpha_i\} \cup \{s : s > i, \alpha_s > \alpha_i\}, \\ E_2 &= \{s : s \leq i+1, \alpha_s \geq \alpha_{i+1}\} \cup \{s : s > i+1, \alpha_s > \alpha_{i+1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

thus by definition $r(\alpha, i) = \#E_1$ and $r(\alpha, i+1) = \#E_2$. Now $E_1 \subset E_2$ thus $r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i) = \#(E_2 \backslash E_1)$ and $E_2 \backslash E_1 = \{s : s < i, \alpha_i > \alpha_s \geq \alpha_{i+1}\} \cup \{i\} \cup \{s : s > i+1, \alpha_i \geq \alpha_s > \alpha_{i+1}\}$. This shows that $\#(E_2 \backslash E_1) = 1 + L(\alpha; i, \alpha_{i+1}+1)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} h(\alpha, t; i, \alpha_{i+1}+1) &= \kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i) - 1) + t + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1} - 1, \\ h(\sigma\alpha, t; i+1, \alpha_{i+1}+1) &= \kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i)) + t + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{h\left(\sigma\alpha,\kappa+1;i+1,\alpha_{i+1}+1\right)}{h\left(\alpha,\kappa+1;i,\alpha_{i+1}+1\right)}&=\frac{\kappa\left(r\left(\alpha,i+1\right)-r\left(\alpha,i\right)+1\right)+\alpha_i-\alpha_{i+1}}{\kappa\left(r\left(\alpha,i+1\right)-r\left(\alpha,i\right)\right)+\alpha_i-\alpha_{i+1}}\\&=1+\frac{\kappa}{\kappa\left(r\left(\alpha,i+1\right)-r\left(\alpha,i\right)\right)+\alpha_i-\alpha_{i+1}}\\&=\mathcal{E}_+\left(\sigma\alpha\right)/\mathcal{E}_+\left(\alpha\right);\end{aligned}$$

the latter equation is proven in Theorem 8.5.8,from [5, p.302], and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{h\left(\sigma\alpha,1;i+1,\alpha_{i+1}+1\right)}{h\left(\alpha,1;i,\alpha_{i+1}+1\right)}&=\frac{\kappa\left(r\left(\alpha,i+1\right)-r\left(\alpha,i\right)\right)+\alpha_i-\alpha_{i+1}}{\kappa\left(r\left(\alpha,i+1\right)-r\left(\alpha,i\right)-1\right)+\alpha_i-\alpha_{i+1}}\\&=\left(1-\frac{\kappa}{\kappa\left(r\left(\alpha,i+1\right)-r\left(\alpha,i\right)\right)+\alpha_i-\alpha_{i+1}}\right)^{-1}\\&=\mathcal{E}_-\left(\alpha\right)/\mathcal{E}_-\left(\sigma\alpha\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus $h\left(\alpha,\kappa+1\right)$ and $h\left(\alpha^+,\kappa+1\right)\mathcal{E}_+\left(\alpha\right)$ have the same transformation properties under adjacent transpositions and hence are equal. Similarly $h\left(\alpha,1\right)=\frac{h\left(\alpha^+,1\right)}{\mathcal{E}_-\left(\alpha\right)}$. □

Knop and Sahi [8, Theorem 5.1] showed that $h\left(\alpha,\kappa+1\right)\zeta_\alpha^x\left(\kappa\right)$ has all coefficients in $\mathbb{N}_0\left[\kappa\right]$ for each $\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^N$. When $\kappa$ takes on a negative rational number $\kappa_0$ it may happen that two different compositions have the same eigenvalues $\left(\xi_i\left(\alpha;\kappa_0\right)\right)_{i=1}^N$ so one can not claim the existence of a basis of simultaneous eigenvectors of $\left\{\mathcal{U}_i\left(\kappa_0\right):1\le i\le N\right\}$. We recall the following from [2].

**Definition 12.** *Let $\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{N}_0^N$ and let $m,n\in\mathbb{N}$ with $\gcd\left(m,n\right)=1$ then say $\left(\alpha,\beta\right)$ is a $\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)$-critical pair (for $\alpha$) if $\alpha\rhd\beta$ and $\left(n\kappa+m\right)$ divides $\left(r\left(\beta,i\right)-r\left(\alpha,i\right)\right)\kappa+\alpha_i-\beta_i$ (in $\mathbb{Q}\left[\kappa\right]$) for $1\le i\le N$.*

The definition implies $\xi_i\left(\alpha;-\frac{m}{n}\right)=\xi_i\left(\beta;-\frac{m}{n}\right)$ for $1\le i\le N$. We can deduce the existence of simple poles at $\kappa=-\frac{m}{n}$ in a certain coefficient.

**Lemma 6.** *Suppose $\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{N}_0^N$, $h\left(\alpha,\kappa+1\right)$ has a simple zero at $\kappa_0\in\mathbb{Q}$ and $\left(\alpha,\beta\right)$ is the unique $\kappa_0$-critical pair for $\alpha$, then $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\alpha^x\left(\kappa\right),\beta\right)$ has a simple pole at $\kappa_0$.*

*Proof.* Since $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\alpha^x\left(\kappa\right),\beta\right)$ is independent of the number of variables $N$ provided $N\ge\max\left(\ell\left(\alpha\right),\ell\left(\beta\right)\right)$ we may assume $N=\ell\left(\alpha\right)+\left|\alpha\right|$. Let $\gamma=\left(0^{\ell\left(\alpha\right)},1^{\left|\alpha\right|}\right)\in\mathbb{N}_0^N$ then by [8] $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\alpha^x\left(\kappa\right),\gamma\right)=\left(\left|\alpha\right|\right)!\kappa^{\left|\alpha\right|}/h\left(\alpha,\kappa+1\right)$. Let $f=\lim_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\left(\kappa-\kappa_0\right)\zeta_\alpha^x\left(\kappa\right)$ which exists as a polynomial over $\mathbb{Q}$ by hypothesis and is not zero because $\lim_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\left(\kappa-\kappa_0\right)\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\alpha^x\left(\kappa\right),\gamma\right)\neq0$. The polynomial $f$ is a simultaneous eigenvector for $\left\{\mathcal{U}_i\left(\kappa_0\right):1\le i\le N\right\}$ because $\mathcal{U}_i\left(\kappa_0\right)f=\lim_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\left(\kappa-\kappa_0\right)\mathcal{U}_i\left(\kappa\right)\zeta_\alpha^x\left(\kappa\right)=\xi_i\left(\alpha;\kappa_0\right)f$. Let $\gamma$ be a $\rhd$-maximal element of $\left\{\delta\in\mathbb{N}_0^N:\operatorname{coef}\left(f,\delta\right)\neq0\right\}$. By $\rhd$-triangularity $\xi_i\left(\alpha;\kappa_0\right)=\xi_i\left(\delta;\kappa_0\right)$ for each $i$, thus $\delta=\alpha$ or $\delta=\beta$ by definition of critical pairs. It is impossible for $\delta=\alpha$ since $\operatorname{coef}\left(f,\alpha\right)=\lim_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\left(\kappa-\kappa_0\right)=0$ hence $\delta=\beta$. So $\operatorname{coef}\left(f,\beta\right)=\lim_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\left(\kappa-\kappa_0\right)\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\alpha^x\left(\kappa\right),\beta\right)\neq0$. □

In the next sections the Lemma will be combined with Theorem 3.

**Example 1.** *The conceptual proof of the Lemma may be the only reasonably effective method. For example in the next section we need the conclusion of Lemma 6 for $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_{\left(5,6\right)}^x\left(\kappa\right),\left(2,0,3,3,3\right)\right)$, which arises for $N=5,\tau=\left(3,2\right),\kappa_0=-\frac{3}{2}$.*

*There is a combinatorial formula for the coefficients of* $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ *due to Knop and Sahi* [8]*, which requires a sum over* $3! \times 1721$ *configurations for this example (the factorial comes from permuting the indices* $(3,4,5)$*). By direct (computer algebra) calculations this coefficient equals*

$$\frac{30\kappa^3(1+\kappa)^2(62\kappa^3+135\kappa^2+78\kappa+40)}{(2\kappa+3)(2\kappa+5)(\kappa+2)^2(\kappa+3)^2(\kappa+4)(\kappa+5)}.$$

*The expression suggests that there is no practical closed form.*

We address the problem of the relationship of a simultaneous eigenvector of $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) : 1 \le i \le N\}$ to the nonsymmetric Jack polynomials; namely, how can such a polynomial be expressed as a limit as $\kappa \to \kappa_0$? For a given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ and $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ let $C(\alpha,\kappa_0) = \{\beta : (\alpha,\beta) \text{ is a } \kappa_0\text{-critical pair}\}$. In the proof we again use the field $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(\kappa, v)$ and the operator $\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)$; otherwise to each $\gamma \in E$ one has to associate some $i$ for which $\xi_i(\alpha;\kappa_0) \ne \xi_i(\gamma;\kappa_0)$. The expressions we consider are all rational in $\kappa$ (now with values in $\mathbb{Q}(v)$) so having no pole at $\kappa_0$ is equivalent to being analytic in a neighborhood of $\kappa_0$.

**Theorem 4.** *Suppose for some* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ *and* $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ *that there exists a simultaneous eigenvector* $g_\alpha = x^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \lhd \alpha} A_\beta x^\beta$ *of* $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) : 1 \le i \le N\}$*, with the coefficients* $A_\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$*, then there are coefficients* $B_\beta(\kappa) \in \mathbb{K}$ *defined for* $\beta \in C(\alpha,\kappa_0)$ *such that the polynomial* $q_\alpha(\kappa) = \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \sum \left\{ B_\beta(\kappa)\, \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa) : \beta \in C(\alpha,\kappa_0) \right\}$ *has no pole at* $\kappa_0$ *and* $\lim\limits_{\kappa \to \kappa_0} q_\alpha(\kappa) = g_\alpha$*.*

*Proof.* By the triangularity property $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0)\, g_\alpha = \xi_i(\alpha;\kappa_0)\, g_\alpha$. For generic $\kappa$ there are coefficients $B'_\gamma(\kappa)$ defined for all $\gamma \lhd \alpha$ so that $g_\alpha = \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \sum_{\gamma \lhd \alpha} B'_\gamma(\kappa)\, \zeta_\gamma^x(\kappa)$ (because the nonsymmetric Jack polynomials form a basis and the change-of-basis matrix is unimodular and triangular). Let $E = \{\gamma : \gamma \lhd \alpha, \gamma \notin C(\alpha,\kappa_0)\}$. Apply the operator

$$\mathcal{V}(\kappa) := \prod\nolimits_{\gamma \in E} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \left(\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma;\kappa)\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \left(\xi_i(\alpha;\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma;\kappa)\right)}$$

to both sides of the equation for $g_\alpha$, thus annihilating all $\zeta_\gamma^x(\kappa)$ with $\gamma \in E$. The right hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}(\kappa)\, g_\alpha &= \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \sum_{\beta \in C(\alpha,\kappa_0)} B'_\beta(\kappa) \left( \prod\nolimits_{\gamma \in E} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \left(\xi_i(\beta;\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma;\kappa)\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \left(\xi_i(\alpha;\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma;\kappa)\right)} \right) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa) \\ &= \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \sum_{\beta \in C(\alpha,\kappa_0)} B_\beta(\kappa)\, \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa),\end{aligned}$$

with the last equation implicitly defining the coefficients $B_\beta(\kappa)$.We use the operators $\mathcal{B}_i$ from Definition 8. To evaluate $\mathcal{V}(\kappa)\, g_\alpha$ directly we consider

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma;\kappa)\right) g_\alpha - \left(\xi_i(\alpha;\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma;\kappa)\right) g_\alpha \\ &= \left(\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) + (\kappa - \kappa_0)\, \mathcal{B}_i - \xi_i(\alpha;\kappa)\right) g_\alpha \\ &= \left(\xi_i(\alpha;\kappa_0) - \xi_i(\alpha;\kappa) + (\kappa - \kappa_0)\, \mathcal{B}_i\right) g_\alpha \\ &= (\kappa - \kappa_0)\left(r(\alpha, i) - N + \mathcal{B}_i\right) g_\alpha.\end{aligned}$$

Thus for each $\gamma \in E$ we have

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} v^{i}\left(\mathcal{U}_{i}\left(\kappa\right)-\xi_{i}\left(\gamma;\kappa\right)\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} v^{i}\left(\xi_{i}\left(\alpha;\kappa\right)-\xi_{i}\left(\gamma;\kappa\right)\right)} g_{\alpha} = g_{\alpha} + \left(\kappa-\kappa_{0}\right) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} v^{i}\left(r\left(\alpha,i\right)-N+\mathcal{B}_{i}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} v^{i}\left(\xi_{i}\left(\alpha;\kappa\right)-\xi_{i}\left(\gamma;\kappa\right)\right)} g_{\alpha}.$$

The latter term has no pole at $\kappa_0$, since $(\alpha, \gamma)$ is not a $\kappa_0$-critical pair. Apply this computation repeatedly to obtain $\mathcal{V}(\kappa)\, g_\alpha = g_\alpha + (\kappa - \kappa_0)\, p(\kappa)$, where $p$ is polynomial in $x$, rational in $\kappa$ and has no pole at $\kappa_0$. Hence set $q_\alpha(\kappa) = \mathcal{V}(\kappa)\, g_\alpha$, then $\lim\limits_{\kappa\to\kappa_0} q_\alpha(\kappa) = g_\alpha$, and this completes the proof. □

If we apply this result to the hypothetical singular polynomial described in Theorem 2, that is $g_\lambda = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \lhd \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}\left(\kappa\right) g_{\lambda} = \zeta_{\lambda}^{x}\left(\kappa\right) + \sum \left\{B_{\beta}\left(\kappa\right)\zeta_{\beta}^{x}\left(\kappa\right) : \beta \in C\left(\lambda,\kappa_{0}\right)\right\},$$

which has no pole at $\kappa_0$. More importantly, since $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$ is polynomial in $\kappa$, the relation $\lim\limits_{\kappa\to\kappa_0} \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)\, \mathcal{V}(\kappa)\, g_\lambda = \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0)\, g_\lambda = 0$ holds. This is a key ingredient in the proof that $\tau_2 < n$, because we can now apply the known formulae for $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)\, \zeta^x_\beta(\kappa)$.

The basic step is the formula for $\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\alpha)}(\kappa)\, \zeta^x_\alpha(\kappa)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$. The computation involves a cyclic shift. For $1 \le i \le N$ let $\varepsilon(i) \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ denote the standard basis element, that is, $\varepsilon(i)_j = \delta_{ij}$.

**Definition 13.** *For* $1 < k \le N$ *let* $\theta_k = (1,2)(2,3)\ldots(k-1,k) \in S_N$*, (thus,* $\theta_k \alpha = (\alpha_k, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}, \ldots)$ *for* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$*). If* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ *satisfies* $\ell(\alpha) = k$ *for* $1 < k \le N$ *set* $\widetilde{\alpha} = \theta_k(\alpha - \varepsilon(k)) = (\alpha_k - 1, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{k-1}, 0, \ldots)$.

In [2] the formula for $\mathcal{D}_k(\kappa)$ is stated for the $p$-basis $\{\zeta_\alpha(\kappa)\}$. To use the result here it suffices to invoke the transformation formula $\zeta_\alpha(\kappa) = \frac{h(\alpha,\kappa+1)}{h(\alpha,1)} \zeta^x_\alpha(\kappa)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$. The ratio does not have to be computed explicitly since only the values of $\frac{h(\alpha,t)}{h(\widetilde{\alpha},t)}$ for $t = 1, \kappa+1$ are needed.

**Lemma 7.** *Let* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ *and suppose* $\ell(\alpha) = k$ *then* $\dfrac{h(\alpha,t)}{h(\widetilde{\alpha},t)} = (k - r(\alpha,k))\,\kappa + t + \alpha_k - 1$.

*Proof.* Heuristically the Ferrers diagram for $\widetilde{\alpha}$ is produced from that of $\alpha$ by deleting the node at $(k,1)$ and moving the remainder of row $k$ to the top (row zero); then every node still has the same hook-length and the required ratio is $h(a,t;k,1)$. Explicitly, $h(\widetilde{\alpha},t;i,j) = h(\alpha,t;i-1,j)$ for $2 \le i \le k, 1 \le j \le \alpha_{i-1}$ and $h(\widetilde{\alpha},t;1,j-1) = h(\alpha,t;k,j)$ for $2 \le j \le \alpha_k$ because

$$\begin{aligned} L\left(\alpha;k,j\right) &= \# l : l<k, j \le \alpha_{l}+1 \le \alpha_{k} \\ &\quad = \#\left\{l : 1<l, j-1 \le \alpha_{l-1} \le \alpha_{k}-1\right\} = L\left(\widetilde{\alpha};1,j-1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} L\left(\alpha;k,1\right) &= \#\left\{l : l<k, 1 \le \alpha_{l}+1 \le \alpha_{k}\right\} = \#\left\{l : l<k, 0 \le \alpha_{l} < \alpha_{k}\right\} \\ &= k - \#\left\{l : l \le k, \alpha_{l} \ge \alpha_{k}\right\} = k - r\left(\alpha,k\right), \end{aligned}$$

thus $h(\alpha,t;1,k) = \kappa(k - r(\alpha,k)) + t + \alpha_k - 1$. □

**Proposition 2.** *Let* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ *and suppose* $\ell(\alpha) = k$ *then*

$$\mathcal{D}_{k}\left(\kappa\right)\zeta_{\alpha}^{x}\left(\kappa\right) = \frac{\left(k-r\left(\alpha,k\right)\right)\kappa+\alpha_{k}}{\left(k+1-r\left(\alpha,k\right)\right)\kappa+\alpha_{k}} \left(\left(N+1-r\left(\alpha,k\right)\right)\kappa+\alpha_{k}\right)\theta_{k}^{-1}\zeta_{\widetilde{\alpha}}^{x}\left(\kappa\right).$$

*Proof.* In [2, Theorem 3.5] it was shown that

$$\mathcal{D}_k(\kappa)\,\zeta_\alpha(\kappa) = ((N+1-r(\alpha,k))\,\kappa+\alpha_k)\,\theta_k^{-1}\zeta_{\widetilde{\alpha}}(\kappa)\,.$$

To modify this equation to hold for the $x$-monic polynomials multiply the right hand side by $\dfrac{h(\alpha,1)\,h(\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa+1)}{h(\widetilde{\alpha},1)\,h(\alpha,\kappa+1)} = \dfrac{(k-r(\alpha,k))\,\kappa+\alpha_k}{(k+1-r(\alpha,k))\,\kappa+\alpha_k}$. □

The last topic for the section is the action of $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$ with respect to the order $\rhd$. In the lemma the operator is modified to be degree-preserving to simplify the statement.

**Lemma 8.** *Suppose* $\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^N$ *and* $1\le i\le N$, *if* $\operatorname{coef}\left(x_i\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)\,x^\beta,\alpha\right)\neq 0$ *then* $\beta=\alpha$ *or* $\beta^+\succ\alpha^+$ *or* $\beta=(i,j)\,\alpha$ *with* $\alpha_i>\alpha_j, 1\le j\le N$.

*Proof.* By direct computation for $\beta\in\mathbb{N}_0^N$ we have

$$x_i\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)\,x^\beta = \beta_i x^\beta + \kappa\sum_{\beta_j<\beta_i}\sum_{l=0}^{\beta_i-\beta_j-1}\left(\frac{x_j}{x_i}\right)^l x^\beta - \kappa\sum_{\beta_j>\beta_i}\sum_{l=1}^{\beta_j-\beta_i}\left(\frac{x_i}{x_j}\right)^l x^\beta.$$

The term $x^\alpha$ appears in the sum if (i) $\alpha=\beta$, (ii) (with coefficient $\kappa$) for some $j$, $\beta_i>\beta_j$ and $\alpha_i=\beta_i-l, \alpha_j=\beta_j+l$ with $0\le l\le\beta_i-\beta_j-1$, (iii) (with coefficient $-\kappa$) for some $j$, $\beta_i<\beta_j$ and $\alpha_i=\beta_i+l,\alpha_j=\beta_j-l$ with $1\le l\le\beta_j-\beta_i$ (for (ii) and (iii) $\alpha_k=\beta_k$ for $k\neq i,j$). In case (ii) $\alpha=\beta$ for $l=0$ and $\beta^+\succ\alpha^+$ for $1\le l\le\beta_i-\beta_j-1$ by [5, Lemma 8.2.3]. In case (iii) $\alpha=(i,j)\,\beta$ for $l=\beta_j-\beta_i=\alpha_i-\alpha_j>0$ and $\beta^+\succ\alpha^+$ for $1\le l\le\beta_i-\beta_j-1$ as before. □

The Lemma will be used in analyzing the effect of $\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\alpha)}(\kappa)$ on $q_\alpha(\kappa)$, the polynomial defined in Theorem 4. The aim will be to show it suffices to consider $\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\alpha)}(\kappa)\,\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$. We point out that for any given partition $\tau$ with $\tau_2\ge n$ there may be several reasons why there can be no singular polynomial of isotype $\tau$, notably there may be no eigenfunction of $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0):1\le i\le N\}$ with the respective eigenvalues $\{\xi_i(\lambda;\kappa_0):1\le i\le N\}$, where $\lambda$ is as specified in Theorem 2. Our proof singles out one aspect, a certain nonvanishing coefficient of $\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa_0)\,g_\lambda$ which applies to all cases.

## 4. The two-part case

In this section we consider the simplest case where $\tau=(\tau_1,\tau_2)$, $\kappa_0=-\frac{m}{n}$ with $\gcd(m,n)=1$ and $\tau_2=n$. By Corollary 1 $\tau_1=dn-1$ for some $d\ge 2$ (since $\tau_1\ge\tau_2$). We will show that there is no singular polynomial for $\kappa_0$ of isotype $\tau$. By Theorem 2, if there exist singular polynomials for $\kappa_0$ of isotype $\tau$ then there exists $g_\lambda=x^\lambda+\sum_{\beta\lhd\lambda}A_\beta x^\beta$ with $\lambda=((md)^n)\,,\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0)\,g_\lambda=0$ and $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0)\,g_\lambda=\xi_i(\lambda;\kappa_0)\,g_\lambda$ for $1\le i\le N$. In fact, $g_\lambda=\lim\limits_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$. This follows from Theorem 4 because there is no $\kappa_0$-critical pair $(\lambda,\beta)$ with $\ell(\beta)\le N$. (The background for this is detailed in [2]; briefly $\operatorname{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x,\beta)$ is independent of the number $M$ of variables provided $\max(\ell(\alpha),\ell(\beta))\le M$ (see equation 3.5); also if $\ell(\alpha)\le N<\ell(\alpha)+|\alpha|$ then not every factor of $h(\alpha,\kappa+1)$ need appear as a pole of $\zeta_\alpha^x$.) We start by computing $h(\lambda,\kappa+1)$ and showing there is a unique $\beta$ so that $(\lambda,\beta)$ is a $\kappa_0$-critical pair for $\lambda$ and $\ell(\beta)=N+1$.

For the rectangular diagram $\lambda=((md)^n)$ it is clear that $L(\lambda;i,j)=n-i$ for $1\le i\le n, 1\le j\le md$ so that $h(\lambda,\kappa+1)=\prod_{i=1}^n\prod_{j=1}^{md}((n-i+1)\,\kappa+md+1-j)=$

$\prod_{i=1}^{n}\prod_{j=1}^{md}(i\kappa+j)$. Since $\gcd(m,n)=1$ the multiplicity of $(n\kappa+m)$ in $h(\lambda,\kappa+1)$ is one, occurring as $h(\lambda,\kappa+1;1,md-m+1)$. The algorithm of [3] yields $\beta=\left(0^{n},m^{nd}\right)$ for a $\kappa_0$-critical pair $(\lambda,\beta)$. Note $\ell(\beta)=n+nd=\tau_2+(\tau_1+1)=N+1$. Also recall the easily proved rule: for any critical pair $(\alpha,\gamma)$ it always holds that if $i>\ell(\alpha)$ and $\gamma_i=0$ then $\gamma_j=0$ for all $j>i$; since $r(\alpha,i)=i=r(\gamma,i)$.

**Proposition 3.** *For* $\lambda=((md)^{n})$, $\kappa_0=-\frac{m}{n}$ *with* $\gcd(m,n)=1$ *let* $\beta=\left(0^{n},m^{nd}\right)$ *then* $(\lambda,\beta)$ *is the unique* $\kappa_0$*-critical pair for* $\lambda$.

*Proof.* Suppose $\gamma\in\mathbb{N}_0^{M}$ for some $M\geq N$, and $\gamma$ satisfies the conditions $\lambda\trianglerighteq\gamma$ and $R_i:(r(\gamma,i)-i)m=(\lambda_i-\gamma_i)n$ for $1\leq i\leq M$ (as usual, define $\lambda_i=0$ for any $i>\ell(\lambda)$, the equation is a restatement of $(r(\gamma,i)-i)\kappa_0+(\lambda_i-\gamma_i)=0$). We must show $\gamma=\lambda$ or $\gamma=\beta$. Since $\gcd(m,n)=1$ there exists $\eta\in\mathbb{N}_0^{M}$ so that $\gamma=m\eta$ (componentwise; note $r(\gamma,i)=r(\eta,i)$ for each $i$). By condition $R_{n+1}$ we have $(r(\eta,n+1)-n-1)=-n\eta_{n+1}$ so that $\eta_{n+1}=1-\frac{1}{n}(r(\eta,n+1)-1)\leq 1$ and thus $\eta_{n+1}=1$ or $\eta_{n+1}=0$.

If $\eta_{n+1}=1$ then $r(\eta,n+1)=1$, which implies $\eta_i=0$ for $1\leq i\leq n$ and $\eta_i\leq 1$ for $i>n+1$. Since $|\eta|=\frac{1}{m}|\gamma|=\frac{1}{m}|\lambda|=nd$ we see that $\eta^{+}=\left(1^{nd}\right)$ and in fact $\eta_i=1$ for $n+1\leq i\leq n(d+1)$, since $\eta_j=0$ and $\eta_{j+1}=1$ is impossible for $j>n$. Thus $r(1,\eta)=nd+1$ and condition $R_1$ becomes $(nd+1-1)m=(md-0)n$. So $\gamma=\beta$; the other conditions $R_i$ are verified similarly.

If $\eta_{n+1}=0$ then $r(\eta,n+1)=n+1$ and $\ell(\eta)=\ell(\gamma)=n$. But the conditions $\lambda_i=\lambda_1$ for $1\leq i\leq n=\ell(\lambda)$, $\lambda\trianglerighteq\gamma$ and $\ell(\gamma)=\ell(\lambda)$ together imply $\gamma=\lambda$. ☐

**Corollary 4.** *The polynomial* $\zeta_\lambda^{x}(\kappa)$ *in* $N=nd+n-1$ *variables has no pole at* $\kappa_0$. *The (hypothetical) singular polynomial* $g_\lambda=\lim\limits_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\zeta_\lambda^{x}(\kappa)$.

*Proof.* By Theorem 4 $g_\lambda=\lim\limits_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\zeta_\lambda^{x}(\kappa)$, since there is no $\gamma\in\mathbb{N}_0^{N}$ so that $(\lambda,\gamma)$ is $\kappa_0$-critical. By [2, Theorem 4.8] $\zeta_\lambda^{x}(\kappa)$ in $nd+n-1$ variables has no pole at $\kappa_0$ (since $N=nd+n-1<\ell(\beta)$). ☐

This implies $\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa_0)g_\lambda=\lim\limits_{\kappa\to\kappa_0}\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa)\zeta_\lambda^{x}(\kappa)$. In the notation of Section 3 (noting $N+1-r(\lambda,n)=(nd+n-1)+1-n=nd$)

$$\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa)\zeta_\lambda^{x}(\kappa)=\frac{md}{\kappa+md}d(n\kappa+m)\theta_n^{-1}\zeta_{\widetilde{\lambda}}^{x}(\kappa),$$

where $\widetilde{\lambda}=\left(md-1,(md)^{n-1}\right)$. We will show that the coefficient of $x^{\gamma}$ in the equation does not converge to zero as $\kappa\to\kappa_0$, where $\gamma=\theta_n\left(m-1,0^{n-1},m^{nd-1}\right)=\left(0^{n-1},m-1,m^{nd-1}\right)$ and $\ell(\gamma)=N$. The following is similar to Proposition 3.

**Proposition 4.** *For* $\widetilde{\lambda}=\left(md-1,(md)^{n-1}\right)$, $\kappa_0=-\frac{m}{n}$ *with* $\gcd(m,n)=1$ *let* $\beta=\left(m-1,0^{n-1},m^{nd-1}\right)$ *then* $\left(\widetilde{\lambda},\beta\right)$ *is the unique* $\kappa_0$*-critical pair for* $\widetilde{\lambda}$.

*Proof.* Suppose $\gamma\in\mathbb{N}_0^{M}$ for some $M\geq N$, and $\gamma$ satisfies the conditions $\widetilde{\lambda}\trianglerighteq\gamma$ and $R_i:\left(r(\gamma,i)-r\left(\widetilde{\lambda},i\right)\right)m=\left(\widetilde{\lambda}_i-\gamma_i\right)n$ for $1\leq i\leq M$. The conditions $R_i$

specialize to:

$$\begin{aligned}(r(\gamma,1)-n)\,m&=(md-1-\gamma_1)\,n,\ \text{for } i=1,\\ (r(\gamma,i)-i+1)\,m&=(md-\gamma_i)\,n,\ \text{for } 2\le i\le n,\\ (r(\gamma,i)-i+1)\,m&=-\gamma_i n,\ \text{for } i>n.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\gamma_1 \equiv m-1 \bmod m$ and $\gamma_i \equiv 0 \bmod m$ for $i \geq 2$. Consider the condition $R_{n+1}$ : $(r(\eta, n+1) - n - 1)\, m = -n\gamma_{n+1}$, equivalent to $\gamma_{n+1}/m = 1 - (r(\gamma, n+1) - 1)/n \leq 1$. Thus $\gamma_{n+1} = m$ or $\gamma_{n+1} = 0$. If $\gamma_{n+1} = m$ then $r(\gamma, n+1) = 1$, implying that $\gamma_i < m$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. The congruence conditions imply $\gamma_1 = m-1$ and $\gamma_i = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$. Arguing similarly to Proposition 3 we see that $\gamma_i = m$ or $\gamma_i = 0$ for $i \geq n+1$; the condition $|\gamma| = nmd - 1$ shows that $\gamma = \left(m-1, 0^{n-1}, m^{nd-1}\right)$. To verify $R_1$ note $r(\gamma, 1) = nd$ so $(nd - n)\, m = ((md-1) - (m-1))\, n = mn(d-1)$ is satisfied. For $2 \leq i \leq n$ we have $r(\gamma, i) = nd + i - 1$ and $\gamma_i = 0$ so the condition $R_i$, namely, $(nd + i - 1 - i + 1)\, m = mdn$ is satisfied.

If $\gamma_{n+1} = 0$ then $\ell(\gamma) = n$; for this particular $\widetilde{\lambda}$ the conditions $\left(\widetilde{\lambda}\right)^+ \succeq \gamma^+$ and $\ell(\gamma) = n$ together imply $\left(\widetilde{\lambda}\right)^+ = \gamma^+$; then $\widetilde{\lambda} \succeq \gamma$ implies $\widetilde{\lambda} = \gamma$. ☐

By Lemma 7 $h\left(\widetilde{\lambda}, \kappa+1\right) = h(\lambda, \kappa+1) / (\kappa + md)$ so $(n\kappa + m)$ has multiplicity one in $h\left(\widetilde{\lambda}, \kappa+1\right)$. Next we will show $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_{\widetilde{\lambda}}(\kappa), \beta\right)$ has a simple pole at $\kappa_0$, where $\beta$ is defined in the Proposition.

For $w \in S_N$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ since $w(x^\alpha) = x^{w\alpha}$ the transformation property $\operatorname{coef}(p, \alpha) = \operatorname{coef}(wp, w\alpha)$ holds for any polynomial $p$.

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ with $\gcd(m, n) = 1$ and $\tau = (dn-1, n)$ with $d \geq 2, n \geq 2$ so that $N = (d+1)\, n - 1$, then there are no singular polynomials for $\kappa_0$ of isotype $\tau$.*

*Proof.* By Corollary 4 if there is a singular polynomial of isotype $\tau$ for the singular value $\kappa_0$ then $g_\lambda = \lim\limits_{\kappa \to \kappa_0} \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$ is singular, where $\lambda = \left((md)^n\right)$. By Proposition 2 $\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa)\, \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa) = \frac{md}{\kappa + md} d\, (n\kappa + m)\, \theta_n^{-1} \zeta_{\widetilde{\lambda}}^x(\kappa)$. Let $\beta = \left(m-1, 0^{n-1}, m^{nd-1}\right)$ so that $\left(\widetilde{\lambda}, \beta\right)$ is the unique $\kappa_0$-critical pair for $\widetilde{\lambda}$. It is crucial that $\ell(\beta) = n + nd - 1 = N$. By Lemma 6 $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_{\widetilde{\lambda}}^x(\kappa), \beta\right) = \frac{f(\kappa)}{n\kappa + m}$ where $f(\kappa) \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$, $f(\kappa)$ has no pole at $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ and $f(\kappa_0) \neq 0$. Note $\theta_n^{-1}\beta = \left(0^{n-1}, m-1, m^{nd-1}\right)$. Thus

$$\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa)\, \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \theta_n^{-1}\beta\right) = \frac{md^2\,(n\kappa + m)\, f(\kappa)}{(\kappa + md)\,(n\kappa + m)} = \frac{md^2 f(\kappa)}{\kappa + md}$$

and

$$\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa_0)\, g_\lambda, \theta_n^{-1}\beta\right) = \lim_{\kappa \to \kappa_0} \frac{md^2 f(\kappa)}{\kappa + md} \neq 0,$$

and so $g_\lambda$ is not singular for $\kappa_0$, a contradiction. ☐

This argument will serve as the key ingredient for the general case $\tau$.

## 5. The general case

In this section we consider the singular value $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ with $\gcd(m,n) = 1$ and $2 \leq n \leq N$ for the isotype $\tau$, where $\tau$ has two or more parts and $\tau_2 > n$. Let $l = \ell(\tau) \geq 2$. We assume there exists a singular polynomial for $\kappa_0$ of isotype $\tau$ and will eventually arrive at a contradiction. By Corollary 1 there are integers $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{l-1}$ so that $\tau_i = d_i n - 1$ for $1 \leq i < l$. Because $\tau$ is a partition it follows that $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \ldots \geq d_{l-1}$. By hypothesis $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 > n$ so that $d_1 \geq 2$, and $d_2 \geq 2$ if $l \geq 3$. By Theorem 2 there is a corresponding partition $\lambda$ and a singular polynomial $g_\lambda = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \lhd \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$ with $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) g_\lambda = \xi_i(\lambda;\kappa_0) g_\lambda$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. The computations are expressed in terms of (with $1 \leq i \leq l-1$):

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^{l-i} d_j = \sum_{j=1}^{l-i} \frac{\tau_j + 1}{n}, \\
p_i &:= \sum_{j=l+1-i}^{l} \tau_j, \\
\lambda &:= \left((mt_1)^{\tau_l}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2}, 0^{\tau_1}\right), \\
\gamma &:= \left((mt_1)^{\tau_l}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2 - n}, 0^{n-1}, m-1, m^{\tau_1}\right), \\
\alpha &:= \left((mt_1)^{\tau_l}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2 - n}, 0^{n-1}, m, m^{\tau_1}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Also let $p_0 = 0, p_l = N$. Note that $p_{l-1} = \ell(\lambda) = N - \tau_1$, $t_{l-1} = d_1 \geq 2$ and $|\gamma| + 1 = |\alpha| = |\lambda|$ because $(\tau_1 + 1) m = n d_1 m = nmt_{l-1}$. By Theorem 4 there exists a polynomial $q_\lambda(\kappa) = \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa) + \sum \left\{ B_\beta(\kappa) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa) : \beta \in C(\lambda, \kappa_0) \right\}$ which has no pole at $\kappa_0$ and $\lim_{\kappa \to \kappa_0} q_\lambda(\kappa) = g_\lambda$; the coefficients $B_\beta(\kappa) \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa, v)$ and $C(\lambda, \kappa_0)$ is the set of $\beta$ such that $(\lambda, \beta)$ is a $\kappa_0$-critical pair.

We will show $\lim_{\kappa \to \kappa_0} \mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa) \neq 0$ by showing $\lim_{\kappa \to \kappa_0} \operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma\right) \neq 0$. The proof has two parts: firstly we show that $\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma\right) = \operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \gamma\right)$ and secondly we use the Insertion Theorem 3 and the result from the previous section.

**Lemma 9.** *Suppose* $\delta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N, \lambda \trianglerighteq \delta$ *and* $\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) x^\delta, \gamma\right) \neq 0$ *then* $\delta \trianglerighteq \alpha$.

*Proof.* By construction $\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) x^\delta, \gamma\right) = \operatorname{coef}\left(x_{\ell(\lambda)} \mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) x^\delta, \alpha\right)$. By Lemma 8 $\delta = \alpha$ or $\delta^+ \succ \alpha^+$ or $\delta = (\ell(\lambda), j)\alpha$ with $\alpha_{\ell(\lambda)} > \alpha_j$; but in the latter case $j < \ell(\lambda)$ (in fact $\ell(\lambda) - n \leq j < \ell(\lambda)$ and $\alpha_j = 0$) so that $\delta \succ \alpha$. Thus $\delta \trianglerighteq \alpha$. □

To complete the first part of the argument we need only show that there is no $\kappa_0$-critical pair $(\lambda, \beta)$ with $\beta \trianglerighteq \alpha$.

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose* $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^M$ *(with some* $M \geq N$*),* $\lambda \trianglerighteq \beta \trianglerighteq \alpha$ *and* $\beta$ *satisfies the rank equation* $(r(\beta, i) - i) m = (\lambda_i - \beta_i) n$ *for* $i \geq 1$ *then* $\beta = \lambda$.

*Proof.* The rank equation and definition of $\alpha$ imply $m | \beta_i$ and $m | \alpha_i$ for each $i$ ; since the definition of $\rhd$ implies that $\mu \rhd \nu$ if and only if $m\mu \rhd m\nu$ for arbitrary compositions $\mu, \nu$ (where $(m\mu)_i := m\mu_i$) we will assume that $m = 1$ in the rest of the proof. Since $\beta$ is trapped between $\lambda = \left(t_1^{\tau_l}, t_2^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, t_{l-1}^{\tau_2}, 0^{\tau_1}\right)$ and $\alpha = \left(t_1^{\tau_l}, t_2^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, t_{l-1}^{\tau_2 - n}, 0^{n-1}, 1^{\tau_1 + 1}\right)$ we deduce that $\beta^+$ agrees with $\lambda$ in the first $N -$

$\tau_1 - n$ entries, that is, $\left(\beta^+\right)_i = \lambda_i = \alpha_i$ for $1 \le i \le N - \tau_1 - n = p_{l-1} - n$. None of the entries of $\beta$ equal to some $t_j$ can "move to the left" (lower index). For $j, k$ with $1 \le j \le k \le l-1$ suppose that the first appearance (least index) of $t_k$ in $\beta$ is at an index $i$ with $\lambda_i = t_j$, that is, $p_{j-1} + 1 \le i \le p_j$ , then $r(\beta, i) = p_{k-1} + 1$ and the rank equation implies

$$\begin{aligned} i &= r(\beta, i) - n(\lambda_i - \beta_i) = p_{k-1} + 1 - n(t_j - t_k) \\ &= p_{k-1} + 1 - n \sum_{s=l-k+1}^{l-j} d_s = p_{k-1} + 1 - \sum_{s=l-k+1}^{l-j} (\tau_s + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\le i - (p_{j-1} + 1) = p_{k-1} - p_{j-1} - \sum_{s=l-k+1}^{l-j} (\tau_s + 1) \\ &= \sum_{s=l+2-k}^{l+1-j} \tau_s - \sum_{s=l-k+1}^{l-j} \tau_s - (k-j) = \tau_{l+1-j} - \tau_{l-k+1} - (k-j) \\ &\le j - k \le 0. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality $\tau_{l+1-j} - \tau_{l-k+1} \le 0$ holds because $\tau$ is a partition and $l - k + 1 \le l - j + 1$ by hypothesis. The chain of inequalities shows that $j = k$ and $i = p_{k-1} + 1$ (the possibility $i > p_{k-1} + 1$ has not yet been ruled out).

The key to the argument is the value of $\beta_{\ell(\lambda)+1}$ (recall $\ell(\lambda) = p_{l-1}$). The case $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = t_j$ is impossible for $1 \le j \le l-1$; indeed suppose $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = t_j$ then $r(\beta, p_{l-1}+1) \ge p_{j-1} + 1$ and the rank equation is $p_{l-1} + 1 = r(\beta, p_{l-1}+1) + n t_j$ (note $\lambda_{p_{l-1}+1} = 0$) thus

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\le (p_{l-1} + 1 - n t_j) - (p_{j-1} + 1) \\ &= \tau_{l+1-j} - \tau_1 - (l-j) \le j - l < 0. \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction (the calculation is similar to the previous one, replacing $k$ by $l$ and $t_k$ by $t_l = 0$). The condition $\beta^+ \preceq \lambda$ now implies that $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} < t_{l-1}$ and $\#\left\{j : \beta_j > \beta_{p_{l-1}+1}\right\} \ge \ell(\lambda) - n = p_{l-1} - n$, hence $r(\beta, p_{l-1}+1) \ge p_{l-1} - n + 1$. The rank equation is $-n\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = r(\beta, p_{l-1}+1) - (p_{l-1}+1) \ge -n$ and so $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} \le 1$.

Suppose $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = 0$ then $r(\beta, p_{l-1}+1) = (p_{l-1}+1)$ which implies $\beta_i = 0$ for $i > p_{l-1} + 1$ and $\beta_i > 0$ for $i \le p_{l-1}$. Since $\beta^+$ differs from $\lambda$ in at most the last $n$ entries and $\lambda_i = t_{l-1}$ for $\ell(\lambda) - n < i \le \ell(\lambda)$ it follows that $\beta^+ = \lambda$ (note if $\left(t_{l-1}^n\right) \succeq \mu$ where $\mu$ is a partition and $\ell(\mu) = n$ then $\mu = \left(t_{l-1}^n\right)$). Since the entries of $\beta$ can not move to the left, $\beta = \lambda$; in detail, argue inductively that the only possible value for $\beta_i$ when $1 \le i \le p_1$ is $t_1$, then the only possible value when $p_1 + 1 \le i \le p_2$ is $t_2$, and so on. (If $l = 2$ then this argument is not needed.)

Suppose $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = 1$. In this part replace the bound $\beta \trianglerighteq \alpha$ by $\beta \trianglerighteq \alpha' := \left(t_1^{\tau_l}, t_2^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, t_{l-1}^{\tau_2 - n}, 0^n, 1^{\tau_1+1}\right)$, a weaker restriction since $\alpha \vartriangleright \alpha'$ (note that $(\lambda, \alpha')$ is a $\left(-\frac{1}{n}\right)$-critical pair). We will show that $\beta = \alpha'$, which contradicts the assumption $\ell(\beta) = N$. Recall $t_j > t_{l-1} \ge 2$ for $1 \le j < l-1$, by the hypothesis $\tau_1 \ge \tau_2 > n$. The rank equation yields $r(\beta, p_{l-1}+1) = (p_{l-1}+1) - n\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = p_{l-1} + 1 - n$. For $i < p_{l-1} + 1$ this implies $\beta_i = t_j$ for some $j$ or $\beta_i < 1$, that is, $\beta_i = 0$; for $i > p_{l-1} + 1$ the rank implies $\beta_i = t_j$ for some $j$ or $\beta_i \le 1$. This forces the values of $\beta$ other than $\left(t_1^{\tau_l}, t_2^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, t_{l-1}^{\tau_2 - n}\right)$ to be 0 or 1, that is, $\left(\beta^+\right)_i \le 1$ for $i > p_{l-1} - n$. The condition $|\lambda| = |\beta|$ shows that $\#\{j : \beta_j = 1\} = n t_{l-1} = \tau_1 + 1$. Since $\beta_i = 1$ is ruled out for

$i \leq p_{l-1}$ it follows that $\beta_i = 1$ for $p_{l-1}+1 \leq i \leq p_{l-1}+\tau_1+1 = N+1$; indeed suppose the $j^{th}$ occurrence of 1 in $\beta$ is at index $i$, that is, $r(\beta, i) = p_{l-1} + j - n$, $\beta_i = 1$ and $i > p_{l-1}$ then the rank equation implies $r(\beta, i) - i = (p_{l-1} + j - n) - i = -n\beta_i = -n$ thus $i = p_{l-1}+j$, for $1 \leq j \leq \tau_1+1$. The $n$ remaining values of $\beta_i$ (for $1 \leq i \leq N+1$) are zero, and so $\beta^+ = (\alpha')^+$. The condition $\beta \trianglerighteq \alpha'$ implies $\beta \succeq \alpha'$ (by definition) which shows $\beta_i = \alpha'_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq p_{l-1} - n$ (if $p_{j-1} + 1 \leq i \leq p_j$ and $j < l - 1$ then $\beta_i = t_j$ and if $p_{l-2} + 1 \leq i \leq p_{l-1} - n$ then $\beta_i = t_{l-1}$). Thus $\beta_i = 0$ for $p_{l-1} - n < i \leq p_{l-1}$ and $\beta = \alpha'$. The proof is finished since $\ell(\alpha') = N + 1$. ☐

**Corollary 5.** $\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\, q_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma\right) = \operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\, \zeta^x_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma\right)$.

*Proof.* Suppose $\beta \in C(\lambda, \kappa_0)$. If $\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\, \zeta^x_\beta(\kappa), \gamma\right) \neq 0$ then by Lemma 9 there exists $\delta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ such that $\beta \trianglerighteq \delta \trianglerighteq \alpha$, which contradicts the Theorem. Hence $\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\, \zeta^x_\beta(\kappa), \gamma\right) = 0$ for each $\beta \in C(\lambda, \kappa_0)$. ☐

**Example 2.** *In the context of the Theorem there may well be compositions $\beta$ other than $\alpha'$ for which $(\lambda, \beta)$ is a $\kappa_0$-critical pair. Suppose $N = 10$, $\tau = (3,3,3,1)$ and $\kappa_0 = -\frac{1}{2}$, then $\lambda = \left(6, 4^3, 2^3\right)$ and $\alpha' = \left(6, 4^3, 2, 0, 0, 1^4\right)$; the multiplicity of $(2\kappa + 1)$ in $h(\lambda, \kappa + 1)$ is 3. Among other compositions $\beta$ with $(\lambda, \beta)$ being $\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)$-critical are $\left(6, 1^3, 2^3, 3^3\right)$ and $\left(6, 0^3, 2, 4^2, 1^4, 4\right)$; the latter is a permutation of $\alpha'$. For another example take $N = 14$, $\tau = (8,6)$ and $\kappa_0 = -\frac{1}{3}$, then $\lambda = \left(3^6\right)$ and $\alpha' = \left(3^3, 0^3, 1^9\right)$; the multiplicity of $(3\kappa + 1)$ in $h(\lambda, \kappa + 1)$ is 2 and both $\left(1^6, 2^6\right)$ and $\left(1^3, 0^3, 2^6, 1^3\right)$ form $\left(-\frac{1}{3}\right)$-critical pairs with $\lambda$. The algorithm of [3] was used to produce the $\beta$'s.*

Let $k = \ell(\lambda) = N - \tau_1$ and from Definition 13 let $\theta_k = (1,2)\ldots(k-1,k) \in S_N$, a cyclic shift and let

$$\widetilde{\lambda} = \left(mt_{l-1} - 1, (mt_1)^{\tau_l}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2 - 1}, 0^{\tau_1}\right),$$

$$\widetilde{\alpha} = \left(m - 1, (mt_1)^{\tau_l}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2 - n}, 0^{n-1}, m^{\tau_1}\right),$$

so that $\widetilde{\alpha} = \theta_k \gamma$. By Proposition 2

$$\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\, \zeta^x_\lambda(\kappa) = \frac{mt_{l-1}}{\kappa + mt_{l-1}} \left((N + 1 - k)\kappa + mt_{l-1}\right) \theta_k^{-1} \zeta^x_{\widetilde{\lambda}}(\kappa)$$

and $(N + 1 - k)\kappa + mt_{l-1} = (\tau_1 + 1)\kappa + md_1 = (n\kappa + m)\, d_1$ (recall $\tau_1 + 1 = nd_1$). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\, \zeta^x_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma\right) &= \frac{md_1^2}{\kappa + md_1} (n\kappa + m) \operatorname{coef}\left(\theta_k^{-1} \zeta^x_{\widetilde{\lambda}}(\kappa), \gamma\right) \\ &= \frac{md_1^2}{\kappa + md_1} (n\kappa + m) \operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta^x_{\widetilde{\lambda}}(\kappa), \theta_k \gamma\right). \end{aligned}$$

We finish the argument by using the Insertion Theorem 3. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \left((mt_1)^{\tau_l}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \ldots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2 - n}\right), \\ \nu &= \left(mt_{l-1} - 1, (mt_{l-1})^{n-1}, 0^{\tau_1}\right), \\ \sigma &= \left(m - 1, 0^{n-1}, m^{\tau_1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

then $\widetilde{\lambda} = \iota(1, \mu)\, \nu$ and $\widetilde{\alpha} = \iota(1, \mu)\, \sigma$.

**Lemma 10.** $\lim_{\kappa\rightarrow\kappa_0} \operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\,\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa),\gamma\right)\neq 0.$

*Proof.* Let $p = mt_{l-1} = md_1$, and $M = n+\tau_1$ then $\nu,\sigma\in I_{1,p}^{(M)}$. By Theorem 3 $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_{\widetilde{\lambda}}^x(\kappa),\widetilde{\alpha}\right) = \operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\nu^x(\kappa),\sigma\right)$ and by Proposition 4 and Lemma 6 $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\nu^x(\kappa),\sigma\right)$ has a simple pole at $\kappa=\kappa_0$ (this is the same argument used in the previous section). Thus there exists $f(\kappa)\in\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$ so that $\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_\nu^x(\kappa),\sigma\right)=\frac{f(\kappa)}{n\kappa+m}$ and $f(\kappa_0)\neq 0$. To conclude,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\,\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa),\gamma\right) &= \frac{md_1^2}{\kappa+md_1}(n\kappa+m)\operatorname{coef}\left(\zeta_{\widetilde{\lambda}}^x(\kappa),\widetilde{\alpha}\right)\\ &= \frac{md_1^2}{\kappa+md_1}f(\kappa)\end{aligned}$$

which has a nonzero limit at $\kappa_0$. ☐

**Theorem 7.** *Suppose* $\kappa_0=-\frac{m}{n}$ *with* $\gcd(m,n)=1$ *and* $\tau$ *is a partition of* $N$ *such that* $n|(\tau_i+1)$ *for* $1\le i<\ell(\tau)$. *If* $\tau_2\ge n$ *then there are no singular polynomials for* $\kappa_0$ *of isotype* $\tau$.

*Proof.* For $\tau_2>n$ if there is a singular polynomial of isotype $\tau$ for the singular value then $\lim_{\kappa\rightarrow\kappa_0}\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\,q_\lambda(\kappa)=0$ for the polynomial $q_\lambda(\kappa)$ described above. But $\lim_{\kappa\rightarrow\kappa_0}\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\,q_\lambda(\kappa),\gamma\right)=\lim_{\kappa\rightarrow\kappa_0}\operatorname{coef}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa)\,\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa),\gamma\right)\neq 0$, and so these singular polynomials do not exist. The case $\tau_2=n,\ell(\tau)=2$ was done in the previous section. ☐

## 6. Concluding remarks

Together with the results of [2, Theorem 2.7] we have a complete description of singular polynomials for the group $S_N$. For each pair $(m_0,n_0)\in\mathbb{N}^2$ with $2\le n_0\le N$ and $\frac{m_0}{n_0}\notin\mathbb{N}$, let $d=\gcd(m_0,n_0)\,,m=\frac{m_0}{d},n=\frac{n_0}{d}$, then there is a unique irreducible $S_N$-module of singular polynomials for the singular value $\kappa_0=-\frac{m}{n}$ of isotype $\tau$, where

$$\begin{aligned} l &= \left\lceil\frac{N-n_0+1}{n-1}\right\rceil+1 \\ \tau &= \left(n_0-1,(n-1)^{l-2},\tau_l\right). \end{aligned}\tag{6.1}$$

The number $l=\ell(\tau)$ is the solution of the inequality $1\le\tau_l=(N-n_0+1)-(l-2)(n-1)\le n-1$ ($\lceil r\rceil$ denotes the smallest integer $\ge r$). Then the index for the corresponding singular polynomial is given by:

$$\lambda=\begin{cases}\left(m_0^{\tau_2},0^{n_0-1}\right), & l=2\\ \left((m_0+(l-2)\,m)^{\tau_l},(m_0+(l-3)\,m)^{n-1},\ldots,m_0^{n-1},0^{n_0-1}\right), & l\ge 3\end{cases}.\tag{6.2}$$

Note that $l=2$ is equivalent to $N-n_0+1<n$ or $d<\frac{n_0}{N-n_0+1}$, and $\tau_2=N-n_0+1$. For $l\ge 3$ the computation for $\lambda$ uses the notation of the previous section with $t_i=d+l-1-i,mt_i=m_0+(l-1-i)\,m$ for $1\le i\le l-1$. The $S_N$-module of singular polynomials is $\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left\{w\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa_0):w\in S_N\right\}$ and the basis corresponding to Murphy's construction is exactly the set of $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa_0)$ such that $\alpha$ is a reverse lattice permutation of $\lambda$. There are no other singular polynomials.

The relation of modules of singular polynomials to monodromy representations of the Hecke algebra was discussed in [4, Sect.6]. The parameter is $q = e^{-2\pi \mathrm{i}\kappa}$; the existence of singular polynomials of isotype $\tau$ shows that the monodromy representation corresponding to $\tau$ contains the trivial representation. There is a general result on the connection between monodromy (called the KZ-functor) and the dual Specht modules in [7, Sect. 6.2].

Recall the definition of the rational Cherednik algebra (see [7, Sect. 3] and [6]). We consider the image $A(\kappa)$ under the faithful representation on $\mathcal{P}$; indeed $A(\kappa)$ is the $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$-algebra generated by $\{\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N\} \cup \{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\} \cup S_N$ (where $x_i$ denotes the multiplication map $p(x) \mapsto x_i p(x)$ and $w \in S_N$ acts by $p(x) \mapsto p(xw)$ for $p \in \mathcal{P}$). In the sequel, when $\kappa$ is specialized to a rational $\kappa_0$,we use $\mathcal{P}$ to denote the polynomials with rational coefficients (that is, $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left\{x^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N\right\}$). Here are some basic results about $A(\kappa)$-submodules of $\mathcal{P}$.

**Proposition 5.** *Suppose $M$ is a nontrivial proper $A(\kappa_0)$-submodule of $\mathcal{P}$ for some $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $M$ is the direct sum of its homogeneous components $M_n := M \cap \mathcal{P}_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the nonzero component $M_{n_0}$ of least degree ($M_j = \{0\}$ for $j < n_0$) is an $S_N$-module of singular polynomials and $\kappa_0$ is a singular value.*

*Proof.* The identity $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \kappa \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (1 - (i,j))$ implies that the Euler operator $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \in A(\kappa)$. Hence $M = \sum_{n=0}^\infty (M \cap \mathcal{P}_n)$. There exists $n_0 > 0$ such that $M_{n_0} \neq \{0\}$ and $M_j = \{0\}$ for $0 \leq j < n_0$ (or else $M_0 \neq \{0\}, 1 \in M$ and so $M = \mathcal{P}$. Then $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) p = 0$ for any $p \in M_{n_0}$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$. ◻

Say that the *degree* of an $A(\kappa_0)$-submodule $M$ is the least degree of nonzero homogeneous components of $M$, that is, $\min\{j : M_j \neq \{0\}\}$. There is a symmetric bilinear form on $\mathcal{P}$ defined by

$$\langle p, q\rangle_\kappa = p(\mathcal{D}_1(\kappa), \ldots, \mathcal{D}_N(\kappa))\, q(x)\,|_{x=0}.$$

The radical was defined in [4, Sect. 4] to be

$$\mathrm{Rad}(\kappa) := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \langle p, q\rangle_\kappa = 0 \text{ for all } q \in \mathcal{P}\}$$

and was shown to be an $A(\kappa)$-submodule. For $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\mathrm{Rad}(\kappa_0) \neq \{0\}$ exactly when $\kappa_0$ is a singular value.

**Proposition 6.** *For any singular value $\kappa_0$ the radical* $\mathrm{Rad}(\kappa_0)$ *is the largest proper $A(\kappa_0)$-submodule of $\mathcal{P}$.*

*Proof.* Suppose $M$ is a nontrivial proper $A(\kappa_0)$-submodule. Suppose $p \in M_n = M \cap \mathcal{P}_n$ for some $n > 0$ and $p \neq 0$. Then for any $q \in \mathcal{P}_n$ we have $\langle p, q\rangle_{\kappa_0} = \langle q, p\rangle_{\kappa_0} = q(\mathcal{D}_1(\kappa), \ldots, \mathcal{D}_N(\kappa))\, p(x) \in M_0 = \{0\}$. Hence $p \in \mathrm{Rad}(\kappa_0)$ and $M \subset \mathrm{Rad}(\kappa_0)$. ◻

Our complete description of irreducible $S_N$-modules of singular polynomials leads to some explicit results about $A(\kappa_0)$-submodules. We use the notation from equations 6.1 and 6.2.

**Definition 14.** *For any pair $(m_0, n_0) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $2 \leq n_0 \leq N$ and $\frac{m_0}{n_0} \notin \mathbb{N}$ let $M(m_0, n_0) = \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n_\tau} p_i \zeta_{w_i\lambda}^x(\kappa_0) : p_i \in \mathcal{P}\right\}$, where $n_\tau$ is the degree of the representation $\tau$ and $\{w_i\lambda : 1 \leq i \leq n_\tau\}$ is the set of reverse lattice permutations of $\lambda$ (that is, $\left\{\zeta_{w_i\lambda}^x(\kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq n_\tau\right\}$ is a basis for the singular polynomials corresponding to the pair $(m_0, n_0)$).*

The following is from [2, Sect. 6]:

**Proposition 7.** *$M\left(m_0,n_0\right)$ is a proper $A\left(\kappa_0\right)$-submodule, and its degree is $m\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(l-2\right)\left(n-1\right)\left(2d+l-3\right)+\tau_l\left(d+l-2\right)\right)$ (where $d=\gcd\left(m_0,n_0\right)$ $n=n_0/d$ and $m=m_0/d$).*

*Proof.* Clearly $M\left(m_0,n_0\right)$ is closed under multiplication by $\mathcal{P}$ and the action of $S_N$. Suppose $f=pg$ where $p\in\mathcal{P}$ and $g\in\operatorname{span}\left\{\zeta_{w_i\lambda}^x\left(\kappa_0\right):1\leq i\leq n_\tau\right\}$ (that is, $g$ is singular). By the product rule,

$$\mathcal{D}_i\left(\kappa_0\right)f=p\mathcal{D}_i\left(\kappa_0\right)g+g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}p\right)+\kappa_0\sum_{j\neq i}\left(\left(i,j\right)g\right)\frac{p\left(x\right)-p\left(x\left(i,j\right)\right)}{x_i-x_j}$$

for $1\leq i\leq N$. But $\mathcal{D}_i\left(\kappa_0\right)g=0$ and $\frac{p(x)-p(x(i,j))}{x_i-x_j}$ is a polynomial, thus $\mathcal{D}_i\left(\kappa_0\right)f\in M\left(m_0,n_0\right)$. The degree is $\left|\lambda\right|$ (as in equation 6.2). □

An equivalent formula for $\frac{|\lambda|}{m}$ is $\left(N-nd+1\right)\left(d+l-2\right)-\frac{1}{2}\left(n-1\right)\left(l-1\right)\left(l-2\right)$. For a given pair $\left(m,n\right)$ with $\gcd\left(m,n\right)=1$ (and $2\leq n\leq N$) there are the $A\left(\kappa_0\right)$-submodules $\left\{M\left(dm,dn\right):1\leq d\leq\left\lfloor\frac{N}{n}\right\rfloor\right\}$ ($\left\lfloor r\right\rfloor$ denotes the largest integer $\leq r$). The degree of $M\left(dm,dn\right)$ decreases as $d$ increases. This is obvious because the nonzero part of the index $\lambda$ for $M\left(\left(d+1\right)m,\left(d+1\right)n\right)$ is a substring of the index $\lambda'$ for $M\left(dm,dn\right)$; for example take $N=10,\kappa_0=-\frac{1}{3}$ then the values of $\lambda$ (from equation 6.2) are $\left(4^2,3^2,2^2,1^2,0^2\right),\ \left(4,3^2,2^2,0^5\right),\ \left(3^2,0^8\right)$ for $d=1,2,3$ respectively. For direct computation, let $l,\tau,\lambda$ and $l',\tau',\lambda'$ denote the expressions defined in equations 6.1 and 6.2 for $\left(m_0,n_0\right)$ equal to $\left(dm,dn\right)$ and $\left(\left(d+1\right)m,\left(d+1\right)n\right)$ respectively. If $\tau_l=1$ then $l'=l-2$ and $\tau'_{l-2}=n-1$; if $2\leq\tau_l\leq n-1$ then $l'=l-1$ and $\tau'_{l-1}=\tau_l-1$. For both cases $\left|\lambda\right|-\left|\lambda'\right|=m\left(dn+l-2\right)$. Thus for any given degree of homogeneity there is at most one irreducible $S_N$-module of singular polynomials of that degree (for $\kappa_0=-\frac{m}{n}$). The singular polynomials of least degree correspond to $\left(mq,nq\right)$ where $q=\left\lfloor\frac{N}{n}\right\rfloor$.

**Proposition 8.** *Suppose $\gcd\left(m,n\right)=1$ and $N=nq+r$ with $0\leq r\leq n-1$ (so $q=\left\lfloor\frac{N}{n}\right\rfloor$) and $k$ denotes the degree of $\operatorname{Rad}\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)$. If $r<n-1$ then $k=mq\left(r+1\right)$, $\operatorname{Rad}\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)\cap\mathcal{P}_k$ is of isotype $\left(nq-1,N-nq+1\right)$, and equals $\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left\{w\zeta_\lambda^x\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right):w\in S_N\right\}$, where $\lambda=\left(\left(mq\right)^{r+1},0^{nq-1}\right)$. If $r=n-1$ then $k=m\left(qn+1\right)$ and $\operatorname{Rad}\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)\cap\mathcal{P}_k$ is of isotype $\left(nq-1,n-1,1\right)$ with corresponding $\lambda=\left(m\left(q+1\right),\left(mq\right)^{n-1},0^{nq-1}\right)$.*

As well as the maximum $A\left(\kappa_0\right)$-submodule there is a minimum one, namely, $M\left(m,n\right)$.

**Proposition 9.** *Suppose $\gcd\left(m,n\right)=1$ and $2\leq n\leq N$ then $M\left(m,n\right)$ is contained in each nontrivial $A\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)$-submodule.*

*Proof.* Let $M$ be a proper nontrivial $A\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)$-submodule. Let $s_0$ be the degree of $M$. By Proposition 5 $M_{s_0}$ is an $S_N$-module of singular polynomials, thus $s_0=\left|\lambda\right|$ for some $\lambda$ given by Equation 6.2. Suppose $\lambda$ corresponds to the pair $\left(dm,dn\right)$ with $1\leq d\leq\left\lfloor\frac{N}{n}\right\rfloor$, then $M\left(dm,dn\right)\subset M$. The intersection of any two nontrivial $A\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)$-submodules $M_1$ and $M_2$ is a nontrivial $A\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)$-submodule (if $f\in M_1$ and $g\in M_2$ then $fg\in M_1\cap M_2$). Thus $M\left(dm,dn\right)\cap M\left(m,n\right)$ is a nontrivial submodule of $M(m,n)$ which must equal $M(m,n)$ because the degree of $M(m,n)$ is the maximum for the degrees of $M(dm,dn)$. Hence $M(m,n) \subset M(dm,dn) \subset M$. $\square$

One could speculate that $\left\{M(dm,dn) : 1 \leq d \leq \left\lfloor \frac{N}{n} \right\rfloor\right\}$ is the collection of all nontrivial proper $A\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)$-submodules and that they are nested, that is, $M(dm,dn) \subset M((d+1)m,(d+1)n)$. This would be a characterization of $\mathrm{Rad}\left(-\frac{m}{n}\right)$.

## References

[1] C. Dunkl, Differential-difference operators associated to reflection groups: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **311** (1989), 167-183.

[2] C. Dunkl, Singular polynomials for the symmetric groups, *Int. Math. Research Notices* **2004** (2004), #67, 3607-3635.

[3] C. Dunkl, Hook-lengths and pairs of compositions, preprint arXiv:math.CO/0410466, Oct. 2004.

[4] C. Dunkl, M. de Jeu, and E. Opdam, Singular polynomials for finite reflection groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **346** (1994), 237-256.

[5] C. Dunkl and Y. Xu, *Orthogonal Polynomials of Several Variables*, Encycl. of Math. and its Applications **81**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

[6] P. Etingof and V. Ginzburg, Symplectic reflection algebras, Calogero-Moser space and deformed Harish-Chandra isomorphism, *Invent. Math.* **147** (2002), 243-348.

[7] V. Ginzburg, N. Guay, E. Opdam and R. Rouquier, On the category $\mathcal{O}$ for rational Cherednik algebras, *Invent. Math.* **154** (2003), 617–651.

[8] F. Knop and S. Sahi, A recursion and a combinatorial formula for Jack polynomials, *Invent. Math.* **128** (1997), 9–22.

[9] G. Murphy, A new construction of Young's seminormal representation of the symmetric groups, *J. Algebra* **69** (1981), 287-297.

[10] E. Opdam, Dunkl operators, Bessel functions and the discriminant of a finite Coxeter group, *Compos. Math.* **85** (1993), 333-373.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, P.O.BOX 400137 CHARLOTTESVILLE VA 22904-4137

*E-mail address*: `cfd5z@virginia.edu`

*URL*: `http://www.people.virginia.edu/~cfd5z/`